

2757

III, Russa Road

CALCUTTA 26

OPENS. 4-30 to 8-30 lift
except Sunday

TEL. 46-12 30

FINES : One anna per day after the last date below.

RENEWALS : By post, telephone or in person. Quote the number opposite and last date below.

P.T.O.

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

THE proposals for re-union in South India have given rise to much anxious thought in this country. No Congregationalist, at any rate, wishes to interfere with the liberty of the South Indian Churches, and their undoubted right to control their own affairs. But when vital issues which affect the whole of Christendom are under discussion, it would be wrong to keep silent. So far as can be gathered, British Methodists are in favour of the proposals, and so are many Anglicans. Criticism, in the main, comes from Anglo-Catholics, on the one side, and Congregationalists, on the other, though there are Congregationalists, and notably some honoured for their work in India, who support the scheme of union. The Baptists have been strangely silent, but they probably wonder, with us, why some Congregationalists seem so anxious to conciliate those who hold sacerdotal views about the Church and the ministry, and are so unmindful of the denomination that shares the Congregational witness!

We are told that there is no ambiguity in the South India proposals, that, while Anglicans and Congregationalists with diverse (if not contradictory) views of the ministry and sacraments are to join the United Church, they are to acknowledge their differences—there will be comprehension, not ambiguity. This kind of argument makes not the slightest appeal to us. It means that union is to be apparent and not real, a cloak to screen from the “untutored mind” of the “poor Indian” the radical divisions that exist. It secures no more real unity of spirit than exists to-day, and the pretence means loss rather than gain. This kind of lack of reality is driving people from organized religion by the thousand, and while it persists they will continue to depart. There can be no real union between diametrically opposite views, and we do our best work for the Kingdom of God by maintaining our own witness. Take recent pronouncements of two of the Anglican protagonists of the scheme, both of them to be held in highest honour for their life and work. Bishop Palmer, of Bombay, writes in the *Church Times* of 15th November:

In the early stages of the discussions of the South Indian Union Scheme, an apprehension was expressed in your pages that some of the ministers of the South India United Church or the Wesleyans who are now working in South India are not baptized, and that consequently unbaptized persons might be among those who under the Scheme would continue to act as ministers of the Word and Sacraments in the Church after the Union. Knowing, as I do, the importance attached to baptism by the great missions in India, and by Indian Christians, I felt morally certain that this apprehension was groundless. However, I thought that the only way to allay such apprehension was by ascertained facts.

Accordingly, I wrote to South India asking that the facts about all existing ministers might be investigated and sent to me. The Bishop of Dornakal in response to my request wrote to representatives of each mission and district, and forwarded me the answers as he received them. His inquiries are now complete. In sending the last batch, he sums up the results of these inquiries: "It is clear now that you can assert without the slightest doubt that in all these Churches in India care is taken to find out that no one who is not duly baptized becomes a communicant member of the Church, and no one who is neither baptized nor a communicant is ever proposed for ordination." The replies which the Bishop has forwarded to me prove abundantly that no one is ever ordained who is not both baptized and a communicant.

And the Bishop of Dornakal himself, in an article on "Living Forces behind Mass Movements" in the October *International Review of Missions* is characteristically candid. He tells us that to Indian converts "the grace received" at baptism is "as real as to St. Cyprian", and goes on:

Participation in daily prayer and worship, regular instruction in the Christian faith, constant recital in song and lyric, education of the young, the practical exemplification of the doctrine in the lives of the teacher and his wife, monthly visits from the pastor for inspiration and advice, and most of all, the cleansing waters of baptism and the receiving and laying on of hands in confirmation—these do their work in the hearts and upon the minds and even the physical features of the converts.

Most of all! More than prayer, worship, instruction, education, example—the "cleansing waters of baptism"! To the two bishops the Church is a visible institution which can be entered only in one way, baptism: it has its officers, and they alone can perform the sacraments.

It is that mechanical conception of the Church that we cannot share, and against which we must continue to protest as unreal, uncatholic, unscriptural, and harmful. If Indian Congregationalists think that by joining a United Church with those who hold such conceptions they can best do their work and make their witness, by all means let them do so, and may God's blessing be with them. But their action must not be taken to commit other Congregationalists.

We may be asked whether we have not sufficient confidence in the virility of the Congregational witness to believe that it will survive if for thirty years it lives in association with other views of the Church. We believe that the Congregational conception of the Church is inevitable and indestructible, that so long as Christ's name is proclaimed, so long in every land will groups of His people gather together for worship, fellowship, and service—true churches, though they may have neither ministers, nor sacraments, nor "consecrated buildings".

Our business has always been to stress life rather than organization. Institutionalism has stifled Christianity many a time ere this,

and whenever religion has evolved a vast and powerful organization it has been necessary for people like ourselves to break the shell and preserve spontaneity and life. Let us not forget the pit from which we were digged : when there are mighty forces emphasizing the value of the institution and the organization, there is all the more need for our witness to the life.

If we ourselves had ever to choose between a great institution—say a United Church, with a credal basis and with a conception of the ministry and sacraments like that which, starting from South India, the Bishops hope to make “dominant over the whole field”, on the one hand, and a group of Christians, without creeds, without ministry, without sacraments, on the other, we should choose the group as simpler, more natural, nearer to the mind of Christ, and the more effective instrument for doing His work.

Meanwhile it is clear that those in other Churches have a right to ask Congregationalists to be more explicit in regard to some of their views. There is room for a book stating the Congregational view of

- (1) The Visible Church and Its Relation to the Invisible Church.
- (2) The Church Universal and Its Local Expression.
- (3) Ordination.

Many Congregationalists have never thought through their theory, and they and others would be grateful for scholarly guidance. Could Dr. Powicke help?

* * *

THE Congregational Union's Autumn Assembly at Norwich was monopolized by the subject of “Christianity and War.” The speeches on the subject delivered at the morning sessions have now been reprinted (Independent Press, 1/-), and those unable to accept Norwich hospitality—rarely have autumnal meetings been so efficiently managed—will be glad to read them. At the end of the week we did not seem much nearer the solution of the problem—though Mr. B. L. Manning had driven a few of his hearers into pacifism, and the Rev. Leyton Richards had offered compensation by making some pacifists very dubious about their position! We are left with the conviction that in our determination to end war we must all go the way our consciences direct, and cease this eternal wrangle. If we believe the Quaker attitude is right we must follow it, without attempting to flog our fellow Christians into walking our way. If we believe that in an unrighteous world a nation must sometimes resort to sub-Christian methods to conserve moral values, we must bear our witness and make our sacrifice—with regret and without any feeling of superiority. Meanwhile we must all be backing with every ounce of energy every effort made by statesmen to secure, by disarmament and in other ways, peace and international goodwill.

N.B. *Lost. A Bell.* Used to be heard at the Assembly of the Congregational Union, in days when speakers kept to the time allotted. The rank and file of the Assembly will give an ample reward to the finder. Secretaries of the Congregational Union not eligible.

* * *

THE appearance of *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer* (Dent, 3s. 6d.) affords the opportunity to mention a feature of Free Church worship which is becoming more and more common—the habit of reading at least some of the prayers. One need not be intolerant about the use of a liturgy to see the dangers that lie in the frequent publication of these books of prayers—in the minister's vestry where these words are being written there are about twenty of them, all published in recent years. The enormous difficulty of public prayer, the natural laziness of the human animal, and the presence of these compilations, all tend in the same direction—we are tempted to combine the proverbs, "Satan finds some mischief still . . ." and "The sight of means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done"!

It is admitted on all sides that we need more variety in public worship — more silence, and more intercessory prayer, especially prayer in which the congregation shares. The Free Churches would benefit, too, did more of their people know some of the beautiful collects of the Anglican Book. And there may be times and seasons when a printed order of service is a great advantage. But when all has been said Free Churchmen know that "free prayer" is their *métier*—we heard a group of ministers speaking heart to heart the other day, and all confessed that when they read prayers they instinctively felt, "This is not the right thing". When more and more of the men entering the ministry seem to fly to some book or other on every occasion for prayer, and when fewer and fewer of the people in the pews seem ready to pray in public, a word of warning may not be out of place.

This new Prayer Book, we are told, is the result of many years' labour and experiment. We believe it is largely the work of the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, and do not see why he should not say so. It contains Orders for ordinary services, the seasons of the Christian year, and the ordinances of the Church, an anthology of prayers for public and private use, and a psalter. There is much that is good and beautiful, but much, too, that is alien to Free Church *ethos*, and some phrases about enemies that we should prefer to see omitted. In the Holy Communion Order we are pleased to note that the answer of forgiveness to the minister's confession of sin is given by the people before the people confess in turn. This is one of the really Evangelical notes about a book which makes us wonder if anybody who wishes has a right to publish a book and label it "Free Church."

THE Government's stock has fallen a little during the quarter, and it may easily continue to do so. The outlines of its policy deserve the strongest support, but the test comes when the policy is to be worked out. Free Churchmen desire to do all they can to back all disarmament efforts, and are eager to learn what can be done to support the forthcoming Five-Power Naval Conference. Can the Government turn into actual proposals the friendly sentiments between America and England? Its enthusiastic supporters claim that this has already been done, but we prefer to await the outcome when the "realist" outlook of France has found full expression—there is a good deal of Clemenceau in France still!

In the same way we welcome the raising of the school leaving age to fifteen. This is excellent, and we want to help all we can. But what is the Government going to do with recalcitrant and apathetic Local Authorities that are making and intend to make no effort to be ready on the appointed day?

For paper plans of disarmament we want to see actual reductions of estimates; for paper plans of educational progress we want to see schools; and certainly for Mr. Thomas's speeches we want to see employment. It may be that the Lord Privy Seal is being asked to perform the impossible, but as yet there is little visible result of his efforts. We do not want to be impatient, and we are sure Free Churchmen in general are sympathetic toward the Government, but they will not be satisfied with talk any more than will Mr. Maxton and his group.

* * *

ONE of the most delightful books of the quarter is Mr. J. Lewis May's *Cardinal Newman* (Bles, 10s. 6d.). No English Roman Catholic has had anything like Newman's influence over Free Churchmen, and there are hundreds of manses where men take delight in the matchless music of his words. Mr. May's study is perhaps a little too much of a panegyric, but it does convey to the reader Newman's great charm, under the spell of which Mr. May shows himself to be on every page. At times as we read, however, we long for something in the nature of a verdict—a little of the temper, the judicial severity, of Hallam. Mr. May tries to be kind even to Manning; but is it possible for anyone nowadays to think of Manning except as the schemer *par excellence*?

Manning, of course, English Roman Catholics would like to forget, especially since the publication of Purcell's *Life*. It is amusing to find how Purcell still gets on the nerves of Roman Catholics. Mr. Denis Gwynn's biography, *Cardinal Wiseman* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.)—a compact and useful sketch of one largely overshadowed in his own time and since by the converts, Manning and Newman—devotes much of its Introduction to show that Wilfrid Ward's massive biography of Wiseman was so correct and discreet

because of Purcell's "blatant indiscretion in publishing every letter without regard to public scandal or to the feelings of Manning's colleagues who still survived".

The trouble, of course, is that even Roman Catholics have to admit, as Mr. Gwynn does, that Purcell's *Manning* is an "indispensable record": and the letters Manning wrote and received have been shown to the light of day and cannot be blotted out. Scheming, wire-pulling, whispering in the ear of the Vicar of Christ—there it all is for Protestants and all the world to read. Once more we say that we know of nothing better to give to young people attracted by the size and glamour of the Roman Catholic Church than the second volume of Purcell's *Manning*.

While writing of Roman Catholics we are reminded that the other day we heard repeated once more—though the debt to Macaulay was not acknowledged—the statement that Roman Catholicism had always shown remarkable skill in using its converts, in making the enthusiast a champion. Macaulay, of course, had Loyola mostly in mind, and he contrasted the Papal treatment of the founder of the Jesuits with the Church of England's treatment of Wesley. But *has* the Roman Catholic Church been uniformly successful in this regard? Is not Newman an outstanding example to the contrary? What he might have done for Roman Catholicism at Oxford, or even in the Dublin University he projected, he would be a bold man who would dare to say. But every proposal of his for usefulness was pigeon-holed; it was not the wisdom of the Roman Catholic Church but the blundering earnestness of Charles Kingsley that gave Newman his supreme opportunity of service to the Church into which he had been received.

MR. J. L. MAY, in the study of Newman just mentioned, paints an interesting picture of the English Church:

The Church of England may be likened to a ship freighted on one side with a Catholic, on the other, with a Protestant cargo. So long as the rope of Parliamentary control succeeds in forcibly holding these warring elements together the vessel continues on an even keel. When it relaxes, she takes on an ominous list, or rather proceeds with alarming lurches,

'Rolling now to starboard, now to larboard',

according as one element in the shifting cargo temporarily outweighs the other. Some there are who would endeavour to keep the vessel afloat, in spite of the inconvenience arising from this chronic discord, because, after all, she is roomy and well victualled. Others are for scuttling the ship and launching the boats, in hopes of making port over the inhospitable sea of Disestablishment.

It has been disappointing to see "Modern Churchmen",[†] whom we should have thought would love to commit themselves to the stormy sea, preferring the roomy and well-victualled ship. How minds so

acute as the Rev. J. S. Bezzant's, for example, are blind to all the advantages to religion to be gained by severing the State connexion we can never understand. But Mr. Bezzant, so far from seeing these, believes that "the certain and immediate consequences (of Disestablishment) would be disastrous", and he goes on: "Nor are modern Nonconformists eager to see such a weakening of the forces of religion as would follow Disestablishment". This frankly astounds us, for we have never met a single Nonconformist who agrees with the Vice-President of Ripon Hall in thinking Disestablishment would "weaken the forces of religion".

And, really, from "Modern Churchmen" we expected something better than the cheap superiority of the Rev. Alfred Fawkes, whose writings generally are so full of sound commonsense. We quote from his address at the last Conference—the italics are ours:

Mr. Spurgeon is said to have announced to a crowded congregation that his own Church (*I believe it was the Baptist*) . . .

If Mr. Fawkes does not know that Spurgeon was a Baptist he has no right to be addressing a Conference of "Modern Churchmen" or anybody else! If he knows quite well, we appreciate neither his humour nor his taste!

* * *

IN no realm is the failure of institutional religion more obvious than in that of preaching. Anthony Trollope, who had been taken to Exeter Hall, described the sermons as "in their nature odious and so tedious that human nature cannot listen"—this reminds us of Keats's "the sermon's horrid sound"—and went on to thunder the verdict, "There is perhaps no greater hardship at present inflicted on mankind in civilized and free countries than the necessity of listening to sermons". No longer can that be said, at any rate! Most people stay away from sermons altogether, and switch off the wireless when the time for worship comes.

But is it not true to say that those who do listen to sermons have to endure many preached just because it is the custom to preach two sermons every Sunday and not because the preacher has something on his heart to say? How rarely we get a sermon *non atramento scripta sed ipsius viri sanguine!* But when we do we have real preaching, and soul speaks to soul. Let a man who has been tempted tell of his struggles and the way he won through to victory, and human beings in like case will listen and thank God for him. Let a man who has passed through the deep waters of sorrow speak from his heart of the place where he found comfort and peace, and lonely folks will say "This man knows", and be of good cheer. Speaking of that "amazing genius," Tertullian, in his latest book, Dr. T. R. Glover says: "What power of phrase! And how much of his power does he owe to the fact that he had something extremely real to say that called out all his gifts."

If books ceased to be written and sermons ceased to be preached except when people had something vital to say, how much better it would be for the world! But some preachers discuss God as if He were an algebraical formula, and human poverty and suffering as if it were a chess problem. Naturally people stay away, or are bored and listless, and go out even as they came in. If Christianity is to win the world it will be *non tali auxilio*.

WE have read somewhere that when Mr. Gladstone presented the name of James Bryce to Queen Victoria for a post in one of his Ministries, the dear soul had never heard of the author of *The Holy Roman Empire* and the Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford. An even more surprising lack of knowledge has lately been revealed. In *The Indian Ferment* Mr. H. G. Alexander tells of a visit to Java and an interview with the Governor General, and goes on:

He knew of Woodbrooke and said it had a high reputation in Holland, intimating that he shared that opinion. I could not help being amused at the thought that this Dutch statesman, ruler of this great Eastern empire, knew of Woodbrooke, while Sir Austen Chamberlain, the lifelong inhabitant of Birmingham, when I saw him last year had never heard of the place.

It is one of the amazing things of life that a man who bestrides the narrow world of his own interests like a Colossus is utterly unknown to people in an adjacent sphere. Probably Mr. Edgar Wallace has never heard of Dr. J. D. Jones, and the President of the Free Church Council does not know who Wilfred Rhodes is. A man who is controlling millions of pounds could not tell whether Gilbert Murray is a half-back or a mathematical physicist, while the Civil Servant in charge of a vast area in India would be hard put to it to say to which Church Dr. William Temple belongs. We still live very much in water-tight compartments, despite the spread of education, the improved means of transit, the wireless, and all other elements of our modern civilization.

* * *

BINDING Cases for Vol. VII of *The Quarterly* may be had from the publishers, the price being 2s. (including index and title page, which may be had separately for 3d.) A few bound copies of the whole volume are available, price 12s. 6d.

THE CHURCH'S FAILURE.

THE "Church," which is Christianity organized, is popularly supposed to have failed. Some hold it in contempt; others extend to it their pity. No one has a good word for it and even its most stalwart defenders appear anxious either to recover something it formerly possessed or to discard what it now possesses; thereby expressing their sense of dissatisfaction with its present form. From simple elementary beginnings it has evolved into a complicated organism the several members of which do not habitually work together with perfect ease. On the whole, its development has been slow. Nor can it be denied that, whatever its shortcomings, it is very tenacious of life—most of all when that life is threatened by persecution. Whether it be counted a failure or not, however, depends firstly upon what the Church ought to be, and secondly upon what the Church ought to do. It is necessary therefore to agree upon some common understanding of the Church's aim and function, although a more accurate theological definition of *ecclesia*, of which the English word "Church" is a translation, may for the time being be postponed, together with any discussion as to which of the different Christian sects and denominations may claim to be the true "Church." It will be sufficient to consider the matter from a practical point of view and take the facts as they are.

The first question that arises is as to whether Christianity ought to be organized at all. There are those who believe that religion can express itself more adequately through the lives of individuals, without any attempt being made to relate those lives to one another. So long as men act towards one another in a Christian way, what need is there to give corporate shape to their beliefs? The true Church must always be invisible, because Christianity is a matter of the spirit, not of the letter; and only God can know who is sincerely following the way of Christ, and who is making pretence. No tests that human ingenuity can devise can separate the tares from the wheat; both must grow together until the harvest. Surely, therefore, organization, which is bound to be imperfect, is unnecessary. Moreover, whether Jesus anticipated that a Church would come into being after His death or not, He certainly paid little attention to its formation and had no concern as to its doctrine or discipline.

These arguments sound convincing. Yet when examined they are open to serious objection. Even if it be true that Christianity is communicated through individuals and is primarily a matter of individual loyalty, yet it is surely desirable for men and women who are striving for the realization of a common purpose and are moving towards a common objective, to come together in some form of co-operative activity. Unity is strength, especially when cemented

by love, as Christian unity ought to be. Moreover, Christianity, though individual, is not individualistic: it is fellowship, both with God and with men. If a man is not prepared to associate himself with others who love Jesus he cannot justly be called a Christian. It is not prejudice or bigotry or narrowness that prompts this statement, but plain historical facts which no reader of the New Testament can dispute, for if one quality of primitive Christianity is more conspicuous than another it is the element of fellowship; and if this be extracted from the Christian religion, what is left is not Christianity. It may be true that Jesus did not define the Church, nor take steps to build up its organization. But He constituted a fellowship in creating the Apostolic group; and there is every reason to believe that He earnestly desired its continuance after His death. This group was not an *ad hoc* committee which could be disbanded when its work was done; it was a permanent commission, entrusted with power which gave it coherence, authority, and stability.

Some attempt to perpetuate His spirit in an organized fellowship might indeed have been anticipated from the teaching of Jesus. For example, He told His disciples to love their enemies, and suggested that this was one of the ways in which they were to be distinguished; it was to be the mark of their allegiance to Him. But how is it possible to love our enemies, unless we learn to love our friends? There is a growing tendency to wax sentimental over our national enemies; we do not meet them face to face; we do not associate with them in the ordinary affairs of every-day life; they are a long way off; therefore it seems comparatively easy to think kindly of them. But the real test of our Christianity is not in sentimentalizing over those we never meet, but in trying to get on with those nearest to us, into whose company we are thrown by circumstances, and with whose ideals we have something in common.

If a man says he is not a Christian and therefore has no sympathy with organized Christianity, his position is reasonable; but if he says he is a Christian, and refuses to associate with professing Christians on the ground that he does not like their manners or their conversation, his position is not reasonable, and cannot be justified either in logic or in morals. If he refuses to give his allegiance to the Church because in his opinion the Church is unchristian or only partly Christian, he is taking up an attitude which, even if justified by facts, is not Christian in its temper; for surely his duty is to use his influence to raise the standards of spiritual life within the Church rather than set himself in opposition to it.

Some kind of fellowship, therefore, is essential to the practice of the Christian religion; and if it is to be a living fellowship it must organize itself; for all life expresses itself through organization, and the more efficient the organization the more healthy the life. A flower is organized beauty; music is organized sound; science is organized

truth. A human body, which is one of the most perfect instruments in existence, is organized mind; it functions at the bidding of mind until it is no longer required, when it falls into decay. It was not for nothing that Paul spoke of the Church as the *Body* of Christ. No illustration is more apt; no definition more precise. It may be said, therefore, that the Church is an organization intended to express the mind of Christ through a spirit of fellowship—for fellowship is essential to any religion associated with the name of Jesus of Nazareth. The existence of the Church is justified on the ground that without organization no fellowship could function. It may be urged that the machinery of the Church is not adequate to its task. That is a matter for discussion; but we are not at liberty even to say this until we are clear as to what the task of the Church should be. This must therefore be the next consideration.

If fellowship be regarded as essential to the Christian religion, it becomes necessary to enquire what form it should take. Patience is required here, because the issue is so often confused by hasty and ill-considered generalizations. In brief, it may be suggested that in the constitution of a Christian fellowship three elements are involved, which may be summed up as worship, dogma, and propaganda. Worship must be put first because the most important aspect of Christianity is fellowship with God. It may be admitted that it is possible to have fellowship with God in many ways not connected with organized Church services. Alone in his private room; enjoying the beauties of nature whilst on a walk in a country lane; even in the crowded streets of a great city, it is possible for a man to commune with God. But worship in association with others will lift him out of himself and make him less likely to concentrate on his own individual needs and necessities; and these, even if purely spiritual, if given too much attention may tend to make him not only self-centred but selfish. In corporate devotion, too, the elements of praise and adoration, which constitute the highest form of worship, find more adequate expression. When we pray together we are less likely to pray for ourselves and more likely to pray for one another. Nothing brings men nearer to one another than shared communion with God. It deepens and strengthens human friendship. When we meet over a game of cards or a cup of coffee we may be said to be friendly. When we meet in the deep things of the spirit we may be said to be friends. Worship, therefore, is one of the essential elements of Christian fellowship; and though the element of spontaneity ought not to be excluded, yet the kind of worship most likely to be spiritually effective is generally one which is thought out, arranged, prepared for, and made as beautiful and complete as possible; in a word, it must be organized.

Christian fellowship also involves dogma. This is a harsh word and falls strangely on modern ears. But properly understood,

dogmatic religion is democratic religion ; for a dogma is the formal pronouncement, not of one man acting on his own initiative, but of the whole Church. It is the expression of what is generally held and accepted by Christian people everywhere. There are some dogmas which have been outgrown ; though they are fewer than is generally supposed. Yet even in instances of dogmatic decrepitude some truth can always be found at their heart, which it may be needs but to be understood and given fresh expression to be intelligible. After all, it is surely of value to put into words, as clearly and concisely as possible, what has been the belief of Christians through all the centuries, and to give to that truth the authority of the Church as a whole. The essential facts of religion need to be guarded from mistake, misunderstanding, and abuse. Dogma is one amongst other methods whereby these ends can be secured ; and it possesses the double advantage of preserving the Christian thought and experience of the past and presenting it to the world in a manner that is explicit. As individuals, Christians may be able to give an account of their beliefs ; but this is not sufficient. Some general statement which sums up what is commonly considered to be fundamental to the faith, is essential to presenting Christianity to a world which rightly demands to know precisely where the Church stands in regard to its own doctrine.

It may be said that the disadvantage of dogma consists in binding the thought of the present by the experience of the past, and laying upon the spirit of reverent enquiry a dead hand, thus making progress impossible. The answer to this objection is that, although this generation may be better informed than those which preceded it in regard to some matters, we have no evidence to prove that it is more capable of expressing what is the true nature of the Christian religion. On the whole, the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, which constituted the great creed-making age of the Church, in many respects were more intellectual than our own. Certainly the classical Greek language was a better medium for expressing the niceties of philosophical thought than that spoken in any European country to-day. English words like "substance" or "person," for example, are wholly inadequate to set forth, even symbolically, the ideas which the Greeks expressed by *ousia* or *hypostasis*. It is true that a flood of new knowledge is pouring in upon us of which we must take heed. But scientific information cannot supersede historic truth ; indeed it cannot supersede any truth, though it may modify its form of expression and give to it new meaning and fresh emphasis. If it be true that Jesus has revealed certain facts about God, then because God is eternal these facts cannot be overthrown ; though they may be given greater value. The dogmas of the Church, as expressed in the great catholic creeds, are not meant to fetter the mind or lay burdens upon the intellect, but to assist the individual in his quest for the truth by summing up concretely the great mass of accumulated Christian experience and

defining with sufficient accuracy the main propositions of Christian teaching.

Again, Christian fellowship expresses itself in propaganda ; called by some evangelism, by others missionary enterprise. It consists in bearing corporate witness, in each generation as it comes, to the fundamentals of the faith. Christianity is too big and comprehensive to be expressed by one individual, or even, in the divided state of Christendom as it is to-day, by one denomination. In the New Testament the word "church" is used in two senses : (1) a group, however small, gathered together in a particular place ; (2) the Church universal. It may be argued, however, that the first use of the term was a temporary expedient, rendered necessary by the circumstances of the time and intended to be superseded by the wider dream of a catholic, that is, a universal, society. In any event, it is not unreasonable to affirm that, taken as a whole and considered in the light of its historical development, the "Church," even as it exists to-day, does in some measure succeed in presenting to the world a very fair picture of the essentials of the Christian faith. It may be that local "churches" with forms of government peculiar to themselves are necessary to the perfecting of the portrait of Jesus ; that question may be left open ; but it is difficult to believe that denominationalism is desirable as an ideal, for surely a perfect Church would be united not merely in spirit but in form. On the other hand, it must be remembered that each separate denomination came into being in order to emphasize some particular aspect of the truth which was in danger of being overlooked. And with the world as it is to-day, the best service that the denominations can now render is for each to be loyal to its own emphasis. It is folly for the Methodists or the Baptists, for example, to try to gather within their respective folds all God's sheep ; they should be content to care for those who are naturally and temperamentally drawn to them ; and to recognize that others there may be "not of this fold." Anglicanism or Congregationalism or Presbyterianism has no exclusive title to the word "Church" : at best each is but a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ. A few people gathered together in a denominational meeting place are not *The Church* except in the sense that each local group is representative of the whole, just as a single cell contains within its compass the living constituents of the whole organism. So long as the local group recognizes that it is a part of a larger whole and does not seek to unchurch those outside its borders it may claim the rights and privileges belonging to the Church universal. But the moment it becomes exclusive either in form or in temper, it denies the principle of catholicity. The Roman Catholic communion in theory lays claim to be *The Church* ; because it is aiming at catholicity and is not prepared to compromise on its fundamental principle that the Church is the body of Christ, which body ought not to be broken. But in

practice it falls short of its own ideals, mistaking rigidity for strength of principle, and reaction for loyalty to truth. Protestantism would have been rendered unnecessary had the Roman Church been really and truly catholic; for Protestantism is in essence a protest against false views of catholicity. At the moment, therefore, the only way to preserve the corporate witness of the Church as a whole is for each section within the Church to remain loyal to its own vision of the truth, though in no exclusive spirit and with the recognition that for a complete witness all other sections are necessary.

The function of the Church, therefore, is to maintain and develop the spirit of fellowship by a corporate worship in which men draw near to God and to one another; by a common statement of belief, so that the great essentials of the faith are clearly stated and firmly adhered to; and by a united witness to the world of the power of God as it is unloosed in human souls by the grace of the living Christ.

This statement is admittedly far from adequate, not only from the standpoint of ecclesiastical theory but from the more mundane point of view of the practical man. He will ask, and rightly—has the Church no message for the world of industry? Has it nothing to say about war? Has it no word of hope or comfort for the masses of people toiling in circles of degradation and depression? The answer to these questions is that if it is true to its mission as the executive agent of the spirit of fellowship it will necessarily mould the life of the day in harmony with the will of God; and all departments of life will come under its influence. God desires all men to live together in holy and happy love, and they can—if they will—achieve this end. But the ideal state of society which these words connote can only be brought into being by the voluntary acceptance of those principles which are exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus. The function of the Church is to make clear the will of God; to express the mind of Christ. Of course the Church has failed to prevent war. How could it be otherwise when men prefer to govern by principles that are the very opposite of those of the Prince of Peace? Of course the Church has failed to solve the social problem. What else could be expected when men continue to traffic in human lives for greed of gain? The Kingdom of God cannot come by force. God Himself cannot succeed if men fail Him. Having created men free, God has to honour His own work. To do otherwise would be to deny Himself. It is this realization of God's limitation in dealing with persons having power of moral choice that lies behind the dogma of hell, which means quite simply that if man so chooses he can continue to defy God for ever. There is no finer tribute to the dignity of human nature than to say that it has the power to set at nought the beneficent purposes of a good God not only here but hereafter. If the Church attempted to coerce men it would be disloyal to its own principles; and when it has done so in the past it has discovered to its own cost what a fatal

mistake has been made. The Church can persuade, appeal, educate—and that is all. It can support legislation having as its aim the good of the people; but it cannot tyrannize, not even over tyrants. It may be said that hospitals have failed, because men still suffer from disease; that schools have failed because men are still ignorant; that the Church has failed because all the world does not acknowledge Christ. So far this is true; but at whose door does the failure lie? Not at his who is doing his best to defeat disease, ignorance, and sin: but rather at his whose only function is to find fault.

If indeed the Church is to be indicted, it must be on right grounds and for the right reasons. It cannot be blamed because men ignore its message; but it can be blamed for disregarding its proper business. If worship be perfunctory, if preaching be listless, if dogma be disregarded and propaganda ignored, then on the shoulders of the Church a heavy burden rests. Even if the function of organized Christianity were confined to the explanation and interpretation of the great doctrines of the faith much would be accomplished; for Christian doctrine leads to the most serious consequences and carries with it heavy responsibilities. This is not generally recognized, but it is none the less true. For example, the doctrine of the Incarnation has social implications that are very far-reaching; for if God entered into the life of a Galilean carpenter then human nature is precious indeed; all human toil becomes divine, all human life of inestimable worth to God. Here we have a satisfactory basis for something in the nature of a social revolution. So far from hesitating about proclaiming the central dogmas of her religion lest they should offend the modern mind, the Church in the interest of social progress itself ought to shout them from the housetops. The liberation of human bodies and the freedom of human minds are as much a consequence of the Christian faith as the salvation of human souls. The way for the Church to make good her right to existence is to stick to her principles; maintaining her work at the highest degree of spiritual efficiency and allowing nothing in her forms of worship to be ill done or badly expressed. Soon or late the spiritual ideals represented by the fellowship of the Church are bound to win recognition; that is, if those ideals are worthy; and if they are not worthy their doom is certain. This is in accord with the natural law which decrees that all useless things are either destroyed or altered in character. Beauty, truth, and goodness must prevail; the fellowship of love cannot be defeated. The Church is founded upon a rock; if it is true to itself, ultimately it will gather all humanity within its borders; not by force, but by the free and willing co-operation of those whose minds are unclouded by error and whose hearts respond to the appeal of God.

A. GORDON JAMES.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE FALLIBILITY OF JESUS.

IN theological and religious matters one dislikes labels. They inevitably involve some promiscuity. Thus it is not everything in "Modernism" I deny, and it is certainly not everything in "Fundamentalism" I applaud. The criticism offered in this paper should be considered by itself and not as a general repudiation of any school of thought. I do not suppose that my own simple beliefs about Christ are orthodox, but the teaching of certain scholars to-day that our Lord was not without error in His religious utterance and that it is doubtful whether He was altogether without sin is, in my judgment, destructive of that faith in Him which the New Testament declares is able to save the soul.

The position as to His religious fallibility has been stated positively enough by Professor Kirsopp Lake in *The Stewardship of Faith*.

If we go back a little we find that men believed in an infallible Bible, and that belief has been forced from us by the undeniable proof of fallibility. The same may be said of the belief in an infallible Church. But Liberal Protestantism in the nineteenth century thought that historical criticism would remove all the misrepresentations of later tradition and reveal the figure of the historic Jesus as infallible. Is that hope also to go? Yes, I fear so. It is impossible to find its fulfilment in Jesus if he conditioned his teaching by Jewish apocalypticism, and believed in what was, after all, an illusory expectation of the coming of the Kingdom of God.

One notices here a mode of judgment very common in our time, but inherently weak. The presentation of a series of surrenders to criticism is a subtle prejudice. Infallibility may be an error once, twice, but not necessarily in the third instance. Why, then, connect these contentions? The fallibility or infallibility of Jesus—by which, of course, is meant not the question whether He could err but whether He did err—is a matter apart, and Prof. Lake is not justified in seeking the verdict he desires on the strength of other verdicts given in his favour in similar but not identical circumstances.

I do not propose to linger over Prof. Lake's utterance, but I have quoted it for two reasons. In the first place, coming from a distinguished member of the Episcopal Church it shews how little value can be attached to creeds and articles for the safeguarding of the Faith as it is declared in the New Testament. In the second place, taken in conjunction with what follows, it serves as an example of the fact that in Christological thinking our divisions do not run upon ecclesiastical lines. When, therefore, I turn to the similar teaching

of a Congregational scholar it must not be thought that the faultiness of which I complain is in any sense the result of our Church system.

As Congregationalists we may well be proud of Dr. C. J. Cadoux's recent book *Catholicism and Christianity*.¹ It is a fine piece of polemic, at once charitable and learned and acute. The high value attaching to his literary craft, his erudition, and the importance of the position he holds as a trainer of ministers, give a weight to his words such as attaches to the utterances of only a few amongst us. This applies not only to his criticism of Catholicism but to those many pronouncements upon New Testament teaching which are to be found throughout his treatise.

Dealing with the authority of Jesus (c. xi) Dr. Cadoux discusses "certain elements in His recorded words which as they stand seem at first sight to conflict sharply with what on other grounds we firmly believe to be true (p. 212)". Some of these are purely subordinate matters such as the ascription of the Pentateuchal Law to Moses and of Ps. 110 to David. There is no real difficulty in either of these, because it is evident that they are matters in which Jesus no more exercised any judgment of His own than an average preacher does to-day about the authorship of *Titus Andronicus* if he quotes from it as Shakespeare. Plainly here is no issue which vitally affects the religious authority of Jesus. More important is the trouble Dr. Cadoux feels about the "unpardonable sin". He has suggested in an earlier work² that there may have been in the judgment of Jesus here a lapse from His own better thinking into the sterner mentality of those who had educated Him. In *C. and C.* (p. 526) he hesitates between this view and the quite reasonable suggestion that we have in this case merely an "idiomatic Jewish way of branding" this particular sin as "supremely or uniquely sinful". The difference between these two explanations is that the second conserves the moral infallibility of Jesus as the first does not.³ The next difficulty in our author's enumeration, the language of vengeance used in the parable of the pounds (*Luke* 19²⁷) is surely altogether irrelevant, seeing that this is part of a parable and cannot be pressed into meaning more than a grave warning to those who resisted the Spirit of God manifested in Himself.

1 Hereafter quoted as *C and C.*

2 *The Guidance of Jesus for To-day*, 36.

3 For those to whom this utterance of Jesus is a real trouble I commend the illuminating note on God's Forgiveness in the late Dr. I. Abrahams's *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*: first series, 139, ff. "It will be noticed, e.g., that the Confession of Sins on the Day of Atonement—a confession older according to Dr. Rendel Harris than the *Didache*—includes offences of the most varied kind, including breaches of the Decalogue and also those sins ('profanation of the name' and so forth) which in the theoretic theology were pronounced unpardonable. Yet after enumerating them the worshipper adds:—'For all these, O God of forgiveness, forgive us, pardon us, grant us remission.' A certain tendency to hyperbole and to extreme expression in the concrete often attaches to Hebrew teaching. The precision of science is the very last thing to expect in the Jewish mind of long ago, or in the mind of Jesus.

Then in Dr. Cadoux's list of difficulties we come to the belief of Jesus in demon possession and exorcism, Satan, and the angels. Are these matters really an offence to any one, unless it be the man who holds so homocentric a creed as to think the universe empty of all rational life other than that of living men? What if Jesus did believe in demons and angels? Who is in the position to say He erred? When next Dr. Cadoux includes "traces of determinism" in the teaching of the Gospels as an objection to belief in our Lord's infallibility one is almost driven to regard him as a special pleader, bent upon denying that high claim, rather than a serious investigator of what Jesus actually taught. Our concern surely is with facts. "Traces" are too hypothetic and too subjectively connected to enter into so tremendous a discussion. It is only fair to say that the Professor does no more than state this particular difficulty and hastens to concentrate upon what we must all feel to be a far more vital concern—"much of the eschatology: Gehenna-fire, and the retention of the earthly body with its limbs in the next life (*Mt.* 5²⁸, *etc.*): 'eternal punishment' (*Mt.* 25⁴⁶): the prophecy that Jesus will return on the clouds *within the space of one generation*¹ (*Mk.* 9¹, *etc.*)".

Before examining these points in any detail I make one general criticism. With great respect I am frequently amazed at the literalistic tendency in Dr. Cadoux's writings, a quality which leads him to re-name for us most of the familiar people of antiquity, so that Origen becomes *Origines* and Jerome *Hieronimus* whilst the *Epistle of James* becomes the *Epistle of Jacob*, though, happily if inconsistently, Paul remains Paul. The same curiously strained thinking yields for him an illustration of the limitation of our Lord's knowledge in the familiar story of the woman with the issue of blood, for "delicacy would presumably have withheld Him from asking" (Who touched me?) had He known what was really the matter with her (p. 215). Is any comment needed upon such an extraordinary reading back of Western conventional refinements into Eastern life twenty centuries ago? I am compelled to ask whether Professor Cadoux does not suffer from some severe disability through the very meticulousness of his intellectual labours. One remembers the bold but broadly true saying of Matthew Arnold in his essay *On Translating Homer*:

To handle these matters properly there is needed a poise so perfect, that the least overweight in any direction tends to destroy the balance. Temper destroys it, a crotchet destroys it, *even erudition may destroy it.*

I expose myself to a retort by my italics but, with honest humility and a keen desire to learn from Dr. Cadoux, I am often left wondering whether he approximates to that perfect poise which Arnold so

¹ Italics are the author's.

rightly desiderated for the interpretation of an ancient literature. Thus, who would have thought, unless it were a man of unmastered erudition, that Jesus really believed in the "retention of the earthly body with its limbs in the next life"¹? There is a Jewish canon which declares, "Whosoever translates a verse of scripture according to its outward form is a liar"²—a most admirable canon since it illustrates by its very form the precious truth it expresses. As to "eternal punishment" Dr. Cadoux has himself treated the subject so sensibly that he makes his rejection of the infallibility of Jesus on this score the more gratuitous by adding at the end of his discussion that inasmuch as Jesus derived from His contemporaries many beliefs now untenable, He may have done so in this case also and really have believed that punishment would last for ever (pp. 526-7). Yet it is one of the heaviest items in Dr. Cadoux's indictment of Romanism that it holds to the same terrible doctrine! Why, if any alternative is possible, should he entertain the opinion that Jesus held a belief he himself repudiates as "not only intellectually incredible, but morally outrageous (p. 547)"?

If the Professor does no more than consider this a possible interpretation of the intellectual and moral character of Jesus' thinking about future punishment, he is more sure that Jesus was mistaken in His prophecy that He Himself would return "on the clouds within the space of one generation". Now we approach the heart of our differences. Dr. Cadoux has honoured me with a reference (p. 214) to a contribution I made to the discussion of this subject,³ only to question the interpretation for which I have pleaded more than once. My contention was that the language of Jesus here, as so often elsewhere, was poetical and symbolic. I could not expect in so comprehensive a work as *C. and C.* that the author should discuss the evidence supporting my argument. I am told, however, that we do not apply the poetic interpretation to Jewish apocalypics generally and therefore must not do so in the case of Jesus. Dr. Cadoux is surely very wide of the mark. We do not, indeed, exempt these Jewish writers from "inaccuracy", but when language like "coming on the clouds" is used we do, as a matter of fact, realize that such phrases are symbolic and not literal. There surely can be no doubt as to the poetic quality of the Jewish mind contemporary with Christ as exhibited, *e.g.*, in *I Enoch*. Dr. Charles speaks of the authors of this Apocalypse as "enthusiasts and mystics" who reveal "on occasions the inspiration of the Old Testament Prophets"⁴. And again: "In the age to which the Enoch literature

¹ In a later footnote the author seems to modify his difficulty (*C. and C.*, 525).

² Abbott's *The Fourfold Gospel* (Sect. II, p. XXII).

³ *Congregational Quarterly*, V. 254, ff.

⁴ *Apoc. and Pseud. of the O.T.*, II. 163.

belongs there is movement everywhere, and nowhere dogmatic fixity and finality". It is significant also, as Dr. Charles has shewn, that "no small proportion of it (*Enoch*) was written originally in verse¹". Movement, "no dogmatic fixity or finality", is indeed of the essence of poetry whether there be verse-form or not. And the dream-visions of *Enoch*, the brilliantly imaginative descriptions of the heavenly world (particularly in cc. 14-18) can never have been intended in a photographic sense. It is specially noteworthy that the clouds of heaven are repeatedly treated with spiritual suggestiveness. We read of the "spirit of the mist"². And again, "Behold, in the vision clouds invited me, and a mist summoned me"³. *Enoch* is full of the doctrine of the Immanence of God in the form of angelic presences identified with natural things⁴. Associated with this poetic treatment of nature and transparent symbolism is the strong ethical purpose which makes the whole work worthy of our respect. The authors were mystics with a moral aim, and, from c. 92 onwards, their language becomes increasingly outspoken in condemnation of political bullying, cruelty, sensuality, and all selfishness.

Now whilst firmly claiming for Jesus at least the creative quality of genius, and refusing, therefore, to force His utterances into anything like a standardized Apocalyptic, the evidence—a very little out of much—we have just surveyed should certainly guard us against literalizing His utterances upon these tremendous themes. Moreover, in His case we are dealing with one whose teaching is often expressed in the traditional forms of Hebrew verse. The late Professor Burney, in his invaluable treatise, *The Poetry of Our Lord* has clearly demonstrated the fact that a great deal of the teaching in all four Gospels is expressed in the well known forms of Hebrew rhythm and parallelism⁵. He has also shewn that when translated back from the Greek to the Aramaic in which Jesus usually spoke, not only is the language rhythmical with clearly marked stresses but that in some instances—e.g., the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes (except the last) and the parable of the sheep and the goats in *Mt.* 25—it falls quite naturally into rhyme. Dr. Burney considered that there may have been a mnemonic purpose in this. With due respect I suggest that there was no conscious purpose at all, but a rush of feeling such as generally characterized the typical Hebrew poet. Caught up in the full tide of that creative energy which is revealed to us in the order and balance and exquisite correspondences of Nature, His song inevitably received therefrom its swing and

¹ *Ibid.*, 171.

² *Enoch* 6019; cf. *Jubilees* 22.

³ *Enoch* 148; cf. also 10011.

⁴ Cf., e.g., 6922-24.

⁵ From the Jewish side this, in the main, is accepted by Mr. Montefiore in *The Synoptic Gospels*.

assonance. He went through Galilee chanting His wisdom and making music of the Glad Tidings because of the joy of God that was in Him. And when the sorrowful days came and the end was near, the quality of His mind would not alter, only instead of the ballad of the Lord's Prayer came the storm-language of Apocalyptic odes, like the overture of Tannhäuser reaching through terrific conflict the victory of the initial theme. Now Hebrew poetry resembles our modern "free verse" in one respect: it can subside easily into prose. Conversely prose, conversation even, when emotional, easily rises into poetic expression. Thus isolated sayings like the reply of Jesus to the challenge of the high priest at His trial may be coloured by the poetic habit. In no other way than by poetic interpretation is it possible to understand how Jesus could speak of His presence or return, not only as Dr. Cadoux says *within the space of one generation*, but from the very moment of His rejection by His judges¹.

The interpretation which maintains that Jesus expected a universal physical cataclysm—stars falling (where?) and His own appearance in clouds, and angelic bands classifying men, *etc.*—within the lifetime of the apostles, or indeed at any time, involves the grave conclusion that He misled His disciples and subjected their religious life to a prolonged and most unhealthy delusion. The question for them was a religious question of capital importance, for no one could consider that the Parousia would be an event out of relation to moral forces or to the will of God. The very word that is used about its provenance—*συντέλεια* (consummation)—proves the contrary. It is quite true that as to the form of the Parousia the apostles at first failed to understand His mind. But their failure was not confined to this subject alone. They were a long time in understanding how He had made all meats clean, or how He claimed all the world for the Gospel seed. But at last they did put aside that literal interpretation of the Parousia which some of our Modernists would force upon His words. This is evident from Paul's later epistles and from the Fourth Gospel. Did they in this surpass their teacher, being made wise by events or by the lack of events, or was it that at last they understood His true mind?

For ourselves, even as for them, the question cannot be regarded as a purely intellectual one. In view of all that is said about the interim character of our Lord's ethical teaching how can it be contended that His precipitate expectations of cataclysm do not qualify His ethical authority? Dr. Herrmann and others have shewn

¹ Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven (*R.V.*) Henceforth, ἀπ' ἄρτι (*Mt.* 26⁶⁴), ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (*Luke* 22⁶⁹). For a recent confirmation of this rendering see Canon Bindley in *Expository Times*, Sept., 1929.

plausibly enough that such a maxim as *Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth* assumes a much more practicable character if the earth was about to be destroyed¹.

Still more must these alleged errors affect His religious authority. For if they are real errors they reveal a judgment which in the very measure of its confidence disclosed its separation from the counsels of God. Nor can we lose sight of that confident note which is never so strong as in its announcement of the Parousia. *Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away* (Mark 13³¹). That is to say He knew He was not mistaken. Yet Dr. Cadoux says He was. Which of the two is likely to be right? If we follow Dr. Cadoux then I fear we must seriously discount all the other emphases of Jesus. Indeed, what had always before seemed a Divine self-sufficiency in Him becomes now suspect as just a fanatical warp of egotism bordering upon insanity.

Let us face facts. One of the amazing things to those of us who stand outside the high circles of scholarship and claim no more than to be students of the New Testament is the blindness or indifference of some great scholars to the consequences of their doctrines. For a considerable time our churches have been bewailing their loss of adherents. Doubtless there are more causes than one to account for depletion. But this at least is clear—the world will never be won into loyalty for a Lord who is shewn to have been a deluded enthusiast, however noble His sincerity and final martyrdom. But it is not Jesus who is at fault. The trouble lies with the mechanized intellect of the West. We have all been far too quick to assent to scientific methods operating in spheres where they had no proper function. We have realized too little the timeless qualities of the mind of our Lord. And we have disallowed Him that newness of thought which belongs to all those who live in close fellowship with the Father.

I turn now to what is a yet more weakening doubt in the Modernist's conception of Jesus. Dr. Cadoux is not sure whether He was without sin; I believe there are not a few in our ministry, as well as in other communions, who are in the same distressing uncertainty.

Apologists for the creeds confidently assert that Jesus was sinless in the most absolute sense, despite the fact that we know too little of His life or of the psychology of sin to be able to insist dogmatically on sweeping conclusions in regard to such a point, and to build doctrines upon them: nor do they adequately explain why Jesus submitted to a baptism of repentance, or why he objected to being addressed as "Good Master", on the ground that "(there is) none good save one, (namely) God", or why the author of Hebrews described him as "learning obedience by the things that he suffered"².

¹ *The Social Gospel*, 177.

² *Guidance of Jesus*, 47,f.

Again I am constrained to think that Dr. Cadoux's hermeneutics are governed by his theology, for how otherwise could such poor reasons be given for his conclusion? To begin with the last, learning obedience certainly does not imply prior disobedience. In the very context of the passage quoted (5¹⁻¹⁰) there is a contrast drawn between the earthly high priest who needs to offer sacrifices for himself as well as for the sins of the people, and our high priest of whose participation in human sin no such thing is said. And has Dr. Cadoux forgotten those other verses in *Hebrews* (4¹⁵, 7²⁶) which definitely assert the sinlessness of Jesus? Moreover other scriptures corroborate here. *Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf* (2 Cor. 5²¹). *Who did no sin neither was guile found in His mouth* (1 Peter 2²²). *And we know that He was manifested to take away sins; and in Him is no sin* (1 John 3⁵). Two of the passages cited refer to our Lord in His Heavenly exaltation, yet most clearly they pre-suppose the sinlessness of His moral life as the necessary qualification for His Heavenly reign. Are we to set aside the testimony of four distinct types of New Testament scriptures? Was not the Apostolic Church, however mistaken about some matters, at least as competent to judge of this as ourselves?

I come to the next objection, the reply of Jesus to the greeting "Good Master" (*Mark* 10¹⁸). Dr. Cadoux is, I suppose, entitled to say that the version in *Mt.* (19¹⁷) is a "deliberate alteration", made in the interests of orthodoxy. If it be so it is unfortunate and certainly adds a bad mark to the count against the intelligence of the final editor of the first Gospel. It shews in fact that he shared Dr. Cadoux's failure to appreciate our Lord's mind, but did not share the doctor's truthfulness. The reply of Jesus to the perhaps-glib salutation *Good Master* is quite compatible with our view of His character. That pre-occupation with the glory of the Heavenly World which ever characterized Jesus, that absorption of His spirit in the vision of God which led Him to declare that no one but Himself knew the Father save those whom He admitted to a share in His experience—all this made Him a man Divinely obsessed. Just in the same way He said to His disciples and the multitudes, *Call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in Heaven* (*Mt.* 23⁹). So truly did God fulfil the ideal of Fatherhood that by a paradox it might be said He snatched from men all right to use the word for a human parent. If we are to be as literal as Dr. Cadoux I suppose we should say that Jesus meant no one henceforth was to use this term in its ordinary application. Yet constantly He so used it Himself. This is an exact parallel to the saying *Why callest thou me good, etc.* Beside that awful and all-pervading Goodness out of which had arisen the vast processions of happy, creaturely life, and from which come the many quickening and uplifting motions that draw the pure in heart into the felicity of Heaven,

who could be accounted good? Was this to admit sinfulness in the speaker? Rather it was the expression of one of those high moods for which "sinlessness" is altogether too inadequate a word. All the temper of human goodness is self-negating. We are most like God when we are so filled with the consciousness of God that we must needs repudiate all comparison with Him¹.

Again, the submission of Jesus to John's baptism of repentance is entirely intelligible for those who believe in the Atonement. To construe it as an admission that He was made in all things like unto His brethren *not* excepting sin, is wholly gratuitous. That He gave Himself to men as one who Divinely loved them involved a sharing with them of all their burdens whether of sorrow or of sin. The Baptism is the most beautiful incident in all the Gospel story before we reach the washing of the disciples' feet. What a tragic hermeneutic to see an admission of sin in the Saviour's act of sympathy with sinners!

On the plea that we know too little of our Lord's life to be sure of His sinlessness I have elsewhere written what I still feel is a cogent reply². I must needs add that if He was a sinner at all He was a very great sinner. For on this supposition we must convict Him of gross inconsistencies. Certain of His sayings which are congruous with sinlessness are utterly unwarranted if He failed as we all do to keep the way of God with a perfect heart. Thus He denounced a Pharisee for saying "I thank Thee I am not as other men" and He said the same sort of thing Himself (*Mt.* 11^{25ff}). He preached humility to others (*Luke* 14¹¹) and set Himself above all the prophets and kings (*Luke* 20^{9ff}, 11^{31ff}), and nearer to the Father than the angels (*Mark* 13³²). He bade men abstain from judging others (*Mt.* 7^{1ff}) and publicly lashed a synagogue ruler for narrow-mindedness (*Luke* 13^{15ff}). He tracked men's sins to their secret source within the soul and sharpened every moral requirement of the Law: He claimed of men the fulfilment of duty all day long and at evening too, holding that even then they must needs fall short of what they might be to God; and so heightening every revealed standard of righteousness He called upon men to repent and to acknowledge their sin-debts to God as far above all similar debts to their fellows (*Mt.* 18^{31ff})—and yet never once was He known to confess any fault in Himself nor, as is the way with all the saints He has redeemed, to acknowledge that only by the grace of God was He saved. Fanatical and inconsistent—had we not better go the whole way and add with Mr.

¹ Fairbairn's *Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (375,f) has a helpful discussion of this saying about the Good.

² *Aspects of the Way*, 161,f.

Travers Herford¹ that in His conflict with Pharisees He was both savage and ignorant, and endorse Mr. Montefiore's accusation² that despite all His professions He conspicuously failed to love and forgive the men who opposed Him?

But what a psychology we are being landed in! I must not quote the Fourth Gospel as a witness for His life but really, *How can a man that is a sinner do such signs?* (*John 9¹⁶*). There is no need to labour what He has done. "His life", said Fairbairn³, "is written in the Gospels, but His history in the life of civilized man". To which we may add the words of Dr. Glover⁴:

The cynical view that delusion and error in a real world have peculiar power in human affairs, may be dismissed; no serious student of history could hold it. For those who believe, as we all do at heart, that real effects follow real causes, and conversely that behind great movements lie great forces, the fact must weigh enormously that wherever the Christian Church, or a section of it, or a single Christian, has put upon Jesus Christ a higher emphasis—above all where everything has been centred in Jesus Christ—there has been an increase of power for Church, or community, or man.

The doctrine of the fallibility of Jesus both in His teaching and in His character involves an impossible psychology and an irrational ethical world.

II.

When, after all that he has written in criticism of some of our Lord's teaching and in doubt of His sinlessness, Dr. Cadoux⁵ yet bids us regard Him as uniquely Divine, we seem to be brought into confusion. Every man, we are told, is Divine but Jesus was supremely so. But if Humanity and Divinity mean the same thing had we not better drop one of the two terms? The only use in declaring Jesus to be Divine is that thereby we affirm something about Him which does not (as yet) apply to other members of the race. There may be that in us which is like something in God. We may call that common element personality, but what separates God and man is the thing we call a moral thing. The Bible word for it is *Holiness*. *I am God, and not man; the Holy One in the midst of thee* (*Hosea 11⁹*); *The Lord GOD hath sworn by his holiness* (*Amos 4²*). "That", remarks Prof. Kirkpatrick⁶, "is synonymous with swearing by Himself". Holiness is indeed the differentia of Deity. It is, of course, a word with a long history. Beginning in the thought of physical and ceremonial separation, under the

¹ *The Pharisees*, 208: "He denounced the Halachah (i.e., Tradition) with none the less fierceness because he knew little or nothing about it."

² *Liberal Judaism*, 135.

³ *The Place of Christ*, 378.

⁴ *The Jesus of History*, 3.

⁵ *Congregational Quarterly*, VII. 547.

⁶ *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, 174.

influence of prophetic teaching it came more and more to involve the conception of moral excellence linked to majesty and power. *God the Holy One*, said Isaiah, (5¹⁶) *is sanctified in righteousness*. The New Testament idea of Holiness is based there. But as always in the Old Testament the moral purity of God is ever associated with the thought of majesty and power¹, so also is it in the New Testament. Thus Jesus *was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead* (Rom. 1^a). Holiness being the rationale of Deity Jesus was Divine and was so declared (ὁρισθεῖτος) by an act of supreme power.

Now I do not know that it is necessary to attempt a definition of Holiness. But surely it is not compatible with sin. Certainly it must mean the coincidence of an unfaltering will with a mind that entertains no unworthy thought. It is this which I believe about Jesus. I cannot account for His teaching, for His ministry, and for His martyrdom (with all its atoning sympathies) in any other way. Never from the dawn of consciousness to the last moments upon the Cross was there a moment when with the choice of Good and Evil before Him He failed to will the Good. The simple unclouded sense of oneness with God which resulted from this condition of His inner life accounts for all those extraordinary yet quiet assertions He made respecting Himself, and for His exercise of Divine prerogatives in respect to the revealed Law of Judaism, the forgiveness of sins, and the exercise of Judgment both in His own day and in the future. This too must be added—that just as both purity and power were linked in the Old Testament idea of Holiness so the miracles of Jesus were the natural outflowings of His blissful communion with God. In our own imperfect life we know it to be true that goodness, truthfulness, purity enhance natural ability. Could we actually imagine all that is involved in being always innocent and trustful towards God we should not have the smallest difficulty in believing the story of the feeding of the five thousand. Incredulity here (unless warranted by textual errors) results simply from an inadequate appreciation of Goodness.

Unitarianism and Trinitarianism are perhaps both worn-out labels: Chalcedonian theology is impossible: the stories of our Lord's birth do not belong to the original Apostolic Gospel: the four evangelists are not always correct. All this may be freely conceded. But when we literalize the Lord's utterances concerning the consummation of His age, and, denying His poethood, lose His vision of the Kingdom; when we doubt that reality in Him which alone may be called Divine—His true Holiness from the dawn to the dark of His mortal years—we are not only doing violence to historic

¹ Skinner in *H.D.B.* II. 308.

documents but also robbing men's hearts of their strength and consolation.

For what we all chiefly need is something more than instruction and ideal. The forgiveness of our sins is infinitely precious to the man who is conscious of wasted opportunities; yet this does not come first. Peace with God, in the full depth of the phrase, may be our final blessing. But prior to all is the craving for a vision of ultimate Goodness. When there falls upon us some unexplained disaster—a loved child, it may be, carried off by torturing disease, a comrade made imbecile for life by a street-accident: or when in the Church there sounds suddenly the crash of a falling character and an honoured minister or deacon disappears into prison or into obscurity never to be honoured again: or when we follow the tortuous policies of parties in the State, or read much in history of witchcraft, of persecution, of war—then, in such moments it is of little avail to tell us to look within our own hearts for the assurance that Goodness is the final reality, since there also we see an evil disposition, a mingling of motive, an egotism which is part of the whole problem that confronts us. Surely no more agonised cry ever rises to human lips than that which we utter then, *Oh that I knew where I might find him; That I might come even to his seat!*

To see One against whom no accusation can be laid, One who matched the highest ideal men have ever conceived with a life-ministry of uttermost love to both God and Man, is to receive not only the quieting of our distressed moods, but the purifying and uniting power of the Holy within ourselves, so that we begin to grow into the resemblance of Him we contemplate. Surely *such a high priest became us, holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens (Heb. 7²⁶)*. Moreover we only express the very genius of the Gospel when we add that not only is He becoming to us, but that the giving of such a high priest to man is infinitely becoming to God.

A. D. MARTIN.

THE INDIVIDUAL AND MORAL PROGRESS.

IN this age of problems the supreme problem is still that of the ordinary man—how can Smith make his full contribution to the moral progress of the world? When you get down to rock bottom, every other problem is concerned with ways and means of getting the best out of Smith. Our current political debate centres round him. Socialists insist that under the capitalist regime we are wasting Smith's human resources and destroying his possibilities. Their opponents retort that in a socialist State Smith's private enterprise and individual initiative would be hampered and thwarted at every turn, so that his best would never be forthcoming. But, whenever the question is being seriously argued, both sides are agreed that the ultimate test of all political and social arrangements must be what happens to Smith. Obviously he is an important person. The legislature, State education, public health services, national defences, the League of Nations, the churches—all exist for the sake of Smith; to provide for his bodily and mental needs, for the security of his person and his property, for his general well-being, temporal and spiritual. He is the pivot of all social organization, his welfare the goal of all social purposes. Is it possible that such titanic efforts can fail, that in a society organized for his benefit Smith can still remain a disgruntled, half-hearted weakling? It is not only possible, it is a fact.

For mighty influences are conspiring together to depress the ordinary man. In industry, mass production has seriously curtailed his opportunities of finding in his daily work the normal expression of his personality. The products of his toil have largely lost that individual quality which distinguished those of the old craftsmen. Unemployment has brought him the bitter knowledge that he is only a "hand," a "spare part" in the monstrous machine. If Smith is an employer he is scarcely better off. For he is still being moulded to a stock pattern by the pressure of competition and hard times. In fact, all of us—parsons and manufacturers, road sweepers and civil servants—are being standardized according to our particular function in the social economy. And not only our work, but our mental attitudes—our thoughts and views—tend more and more to become an outlook upon life which is no longer genuinely our own but that of the social class or profession or calling to which we belong. We seldom realize how deeply we are committed to these ready-made opinions and attitudes. "Class-consciousness"—being conscious of itself—is nothing like so insidiously dangerous to individuality as this "class-unconsciousness."

This state of things is reflected in current political theory. Herbert Spencer, writing at a time when the pure orthodoxy of "Laissez-faire" was being undermined by encroachments of the rising tide of social and industrial legislation, interpreted the situation under the formula "The Man *versus* the State," and championed the rights of the individual against State interference. Modern political theory is still concerned with his problem—that of the limits of State interference—but his formula has been abandoned. For the group—the voluntary society—has largely taken the place of the individual, and the status and rights of the latter are considered as inhering in his membership within the social group. Smith is considered no longer as an unqualified, isolated individual, but as a member of groups—as a trade unionist, or an employer, or a doctor, or a churchman. Now this method of dealing with the individual and his rights undoubtedly stresses a truth which the old, atomistic individualism ignored. Smith is not a bare unit; he is not only a social ingredient, he is a social product. He is what he is, not as isolated from his fellows, but as linked with them in a hundred different ways. He is the father of a family, a clerk or a commercial traveller, a golfer, a citizen, and so on; and the truth about Smith is not forthcoming until we have considered him in all these various relationships. So much must be granted. Yet the ease with which Smith can be pigeon-holed into the different classes and groups to which he belongs leads only too naturally to the assumption that when we have taken account of his functions in all these several capacities we have exhausted his significance as an individual. It needs to be emphasized that these groups, with their demands upon Smith and his responses to them, only provide the context, the raw material, of his moral self; the driving power of his personality must come from another source. No doubt it is convenient to pigeon-hole Smith with thousands more Smiths who are fathers and employers, for so you make him available for sociologists and others who are interested in statistics about fathers and employers. And such statistics will reveal some of the truth about him. But the whole truth about Smith—his real individuality—is a magnitude which no statistics can ever declare and no scientific methods can ever expound; for it is revealed not by uniformities but by differences, not by the functions of father or employer, but by Smith's own way of discharging those functions. The significant thing about Smith—his Smithness, so to say—is manifest, not in the fact that he is a father or an employer, but in the kind of father, the kind of employer, he is.

In short, we are all members of groups, and in these common relationships and in the common duties they impose we should be as indistinguishable as peas in a pod were it not for the fact that even when we do the same things we do them differently. Other people can do our work—that is what makes

us feel we are lost in the crowd; but no one else can do it in our unique, individual way—that is what makes us think we may count for something, after all. “What do ye more than others? ”, asked Jesus. It is only another phrasing of the same question to ask, “What do ye differently from others? ”. For in a vital sense we must be different if we would make a difference. And this does not mean mere unconventionality or any sort of Bohemian crankiness, but being a moral self—for the moral self is always unique.

The war finally discredited the facile optimism which believed in the inevitability of moral progress. We have outgrown, let us hope, the naïve idea that, as Dean Inge has said, people who travel at sixty miles an hour are five times as civilized as those who travel at twelve. It is now a truism that growing scientific knowledge and increasing command over the external world, so far from being identical with moral progress, are not even necessarily parallel with it. We have seen that the two can be widely sundered, with science advancing by leaps and bounds while morality lags behind or is even at a standstill. The next world-war—which God prevent—will be far more scientific than the last. It will represent an enormous advance in human knowledge. It will also mean the destruction of the higher values of civilization and moral bankruptcy on a world scale. Moral progress—that is, advance in the art of living well—is possible only when man’s mastery of Nature goes step by step with his mastery of himself. And it is because of the enormously greater difficulty of the latter task and the terrible revelation of moral failure which the war brought with it, that to the pre-war optimism has succeeded a post-war pessimism which believes that human nature does not change, that man always has been and always will be a fighting, predatory animal, and that moral progress is impossible.

The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. As against the optimists we must insist that moral progress is neither automatic within society nor a purely natural growth. There is nothing inevitable about it. If the race elects to commit suicide there is nothing in the nature of things to stop it. Yet against the pessimists we claim that moral progress is possible—at a price. It is an achievement to which individuals directly contribute. Indeed, the initial cost of moral progress has always been borne and must always be borne by the individual.

Now we make our individual contributions to moral progress by being individuals, which, we saw, means not only doing our duty, but doing it in a certain unique way. It is not so much our moral output which counts towards progress, as our motives and life-attitudes—our individuality. This is somewhat difficult doctrine. I hear someone say: “Surely what matters is that duty should be done, that a man should deliver the goods. His motives, moods, feelings, and attitudes, cannot matter two pins; it is his outward

acts with their results which really count." It is true, no doubt, that only the latter can be measured. It is also true that since acts can be roughly gauged we can fix some standard the attainment of which will mean that duty has been done. But we are dealing with men, not machines. A man's capacity for his daily duty, whether that be laying bricks, securing orders, or preparing sermons, is governed by other factors besides technical efficiency and the economic necessity of making a living. In industry the effort is made to win a larger output by offering material incentives of various kinds. But we shall not solve our industrial problems—or any others for that matter—until we are securing from every man the very best he has it in him to be and to do. And this can neither be wrung from him by coercion nor wheedled out of him by bribes. It depends upon his own personal attitude towards life. Of course if self-interest is the dominant factor in human activity, then no other explanation need be sought for the dislocations and blunderings of our civilization. So long as self-interest rules, the best will never be forthcoming, either in the individual or in society. But the world's best work has owed next to nothing to this motive. Art, literature, science, religion, social betterment—think of the masters and pioneers in these ranges of human activity and then ask how many of them have worked for a wage or a profit, or that they might fare sumptuously, or that they might win the applause of men. Judged by every material standard, they gave infinitely more than they received, and died with the world in their debt. They did their duty—and how much more than their duty!—but why and how? The answer is simple and profound. They gave because they could not withhold, because they were impelled by an inward constraint, because—in a word—they were inspired. And Smith will be and do his best in no other way.

"But these were extraordinary men." Granted. There is only one Michelangelo in a thousand years. But that is because his particular task is rarely set by the great Taskmaster. The task of being a self and contributing to moral progress has been set for every mother's son of us, and for its fulfilment we need an inspiration, different in kind, but just as real as Michelangelo's or Shakespeare's. We are seeking some power which can make the ordinary man extraordinary, which can make Smith a true individual, a moral self. Where shall we find it? Open a magazine and read the advertisements. Here it is, the very thing! "Why aren't you earning more? Take our correspondence course. If you are a commercial traveller, learn to hold your customers with your glittering eye—and double your income." Not so. Personality is a by-product; we achieve it while we are absorbed in other tasks. This is why religion has had very little to say about self-realization and a great deal about self-sacrifice and service. We have as we spend; we rule as we serve; we live as we die.

If Smith, then, is to be his best, Smith must be inspired; for his best is won only by what wins him. So we return to the inadequacy of merely doing one's duty. Conscientiousness is not enough—for it is uninspired. When I am content to do my duty as a parson as that duty is understood by parsons in general; when you are content to conform to those standards of honour prevailing among your fellows—when each of us is contributing a good average, or even a bit over the average—we are not really contributing to moral progress. The most that can be said of us is that we are keeping things from slipping back—although, since the absence of progress usually means retrogression, even this is doubtful. But in practice the situation in which we find ourselves is never so simple as this. Each of us, we saw, belongs to different groups to which we owe loyalty. What is to happen when these loyalties conflict? It is hard enough to choose what we know to be our duty in face of temptations to neglect or deny it. It is harder still—although the difficulty is of another order—to decide among competing duties, each of which has a genuine claim upon us. This situation sets our moral problem in its acutest, most complex form. And a merely imitative morality is quite helpless when confronted by it. Many try to shelve the issue, and attempt to shut away the conflicting claims in logic-tight compartments—as when a man keeps his business separate from his religion. But this is a poor makeshift which leads obviously enough to bad religion, and, not so obviously, though just as certainly, to bad business. And in any case a man's individuality demands a unified self, and unity is not possible in such conditions. No. The problem must be faced, and we must each contribute our individual solution or fail to pull our weight in the community boat. And a real solution is impossible apart from a constant, critical scrutiny of accepted standards. When we stop asking "Is it done?", and begin to ask "Is it right?", we rise from a purely imitative morality to a morality truly creative, from the pedestrian level of conscientiousness to the inspired heights of conscience. And this inspiration is given to us just as soon as we are willing to face the truth and live by it—not partial truths but the truth of God, the eternal facts of life and destiny. For truth alone can inspire men for service and selfhood.

Why is it, then, that with such resources the ordinary man still flounders and drifts in uninspired living? Well, religion has an answer to that question, but since to-day we are more ready to listen to the psychologists than the parsons, let us hear the psychologists. They tell us that man will endure almost any misfortune rather than face the truth—because if he faced it he would have to do something about it, and that would be inconvenient. So he manages to bury the awkward facts and forget them. It is true that he is seldom fully aware of his cowardice; it is mainly by unconscious contrivance that

he defends himself against devastating truth. One very common method is to call the fact an "ideal," and then it can be removed to a safe distance from every-day life. We reverence the ideal—and carry on as usual. Take brotherhood, for example. Here is the primary fact of human social life which men have elected to regard as a vain dream or a Utopian arrangement. And the war proved to demonstration that brotherhood is not a dream but a fact, so that if men will not live together in a brotherhood of mutual service they must perish together in a brotherhood of mutual destruction—for brothers they are. It is not the idealist who is the vain, unpractical dreamer, but the selfish coward who believes in his heart that whoever sinks he will manage to keep afloat, who fondly imagines that he can contract out of that unity whereby we are all members one of another. Most of the moral evil in the world has its root in this poor-spirited timid selfishness. Smith may complain that he is lost in the crowd—but what is his grievance? He *likes* to be lost in the crowd, to do as others do, to carry on in his comfortable, peddling little way. But moral progress and the destiny of the race wait for Smith to screw his courage to the point of facing the truth of things. Brotherhood is a fact. Very well, then, whether in international affairs or in industry, something has got to be done about it—and by Smith.

You can pretend that reality is not there, if it suits your convenience to do so. But do not be surprised or complain if sooner or later reality trips you up. This world was not built to our specifications. Doubtless we should have made it a far more comfortable place to live in. But the Almighty knows His business, and He made it to be the scene of moral heroism, a place where men might live and grow.

So we must be brave enough to face the truth, which alone can liberate our best. And we face it each for himself. Why is moral progress so slow while science advances by leaps and bounds? Because the scientist can begin where his predecessors leave off. He need not repeat their mistakes or follow them down all the blind alleys in which they wandered. But in the moral race everybody starts from scratch, and moral progress depends upon new victories won by individual Smiths over the ancient temptations. You can give your son that university education you never had; you can exempt him from those disheartening handicaps which embittered your own youth. But you cannot shield him from his own soul's battle. You may leave him a fortune, but you cannot bequeath your moral victory. For this he must win for himself, and unless he wins it his inheritance is more likely to be a curse to him than a blessing. It is true you may help him with advice, and still more by your example; but the fight is his own. And to spare him this—if you could—would be to rob him of his birthright. For he was born that he might win his own victory and make this supreme contribution to the betterment of the world.

No wonder the ordinary man is important, for in Smith the human race makes a new beginning and this old world gets a new chance. Mass-production is not God's method in creating human lives. As the great artist paints a hundred pictures and makes each one a masterpiece, unique after its kind, so the Great Craftsman has fashioned you and me. It is the virtue of spare parts to be exactly similar and interchangeable; it is the virtue of selves to be unique and irreplaceable. When God had made Smith He broke the mould. But Smith can become what God means him to be only if he is brave enough to live in the real world. For truth is no dream and no joke; live by it and you live indeed; flout it and you miss your way and make it harder for others to find theirs. It is a long and arduous task which has been set us. It is not always easy to know what is right and often all that seems given to us is a choice between two evils. But if we are inspired we shall not wholly fail. For we are saved from futility not by our faultlessness but by our reverence; and the great Taskmaster will ask, not "Have you succeeded?", but "Have you tried?". With all our sins and cowardice you and I are the very spearhead of God's own advance against all manner of evil, and if at the end we have made it a little easier for others to believe in God and goodness and to be their best for Him and their fellows, we shall have done a man's work and played a hero's part.

H. F. LOVELL COCKS.

EDUCATION—THE NEW SITUATION.

DURING the May meetings last year two middle-aged Congregational ministers were standing in the porch of the Memorial Hall discussing an item of educational news which had appeared in the morning paper. There joined them a third, a younger man, who after listening for a few minutes broke in: "The Education Controversy! My dear fellows, it is dead and buried—completely!", and moved off, quite uninterested in what he considered to be merely an unhappy battle of long ago.

One wonders if his attitude is typical of the younger ministers and laymen of the Free Churches. If so, it may be that a survey of some modern movements in the educational world and in certain ecclesiastical circles will awaken them to the fact that education is one of the dominant subjects of our politics—as much alive in many quarters as the questions of unemployment or disarmament—and that there is urgent need for Nonconformists to be on the alert.

A new situation has arisen. It results partly from the widespread acceptance of the *Report on the Education of the Adolescent*, issued early in 1927 by the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education and known from its chairman as the "Hadow Report". Partly too it arises from the re-assertion of ecclesiastical demands which Nonconformists have always considered unjust and which educationists believe would militate against the fullest success of the new proposals. Enemies of a completely fair and free national system, against whom our fathers fought, if not with complete success, at any rate effectively enough to keep them quiet for a time, have risen again, more powerfully organized than ever they were, determined to push their claims and to wreck the "religious settlement" embodied in all the Education Acts since 1870.

The "Hadow Report" recommends that at the beginning of the school year 1932 the school-leaving age for all children should be raised to fifteen. It calls for a complete re-organization of the schools, and suggests that every normal child should pass at about the age of eleven to a new type of school with curricula designed to meet the many varying aptitudes of the children and the needs of particular localities. The suggestion has been welcomed everywhere with enthusiasm by believers in education. It is felt to be a great opportunity. The task of these "modern schools" (as it is suggested they should be called) is to deal with the children from 11—15 years of age—"a four year course with complete freedom to try out promising experiments, untrammelled by external academic examinations, to provide the country with healthy, self-respecting, self-reliant young people".

Influenced probably by the almost universal approval and no doubt concerned at the extent of juvenile unemployment, the Government has given notice of its intention to introduce legislation to give effect to these proposals, and to extend the school-leaving age to fifteen years as from 1st April, 1931. This will mean the re-organization of all the schools and the planning of entirely new curricula for the new "modern" schools. It will mean also, since room will have to be found for some 400,000 more children, the adaptation of old buildings, the erection of new ones, and the grouping of schools for the purposes of junior and senior instruction.

The re-organization would be fairly simple if we had a unified system of control and only one type of elementary school. But here again, as in nearly all educational matters, complications are likely to arise from our lamentable system of Dual Control and the existence of non-provided or voluntary schools. Which brings us to the second element in the new situation—the disturbing element.

The Education Act of 1902, which introduced important reforms in administration, left the buildings of the Voluntary Schools in the possession of the denominations, and the religious teaching under the authority of the school managers, who retained the right to appoint the teachers. As a result there are to-day nearly 10,000 schools maintained and equipped by public money, but owned and governed by members of the Anglican Church, where denominational religious teaching is given and in which it is difficult for a Nonconformist teacher to gain appointment as an assistant and practically impossible for him to gain a headship. The entire salary of all teachers is, of course, paid out of public money. The enactment amounted to an endowment of denominationalism out of public funds, whilst in several essential matters the denominational schools are exempt from public control.

Many Nonconformists registered their disapproval in the Passive Resistance Movement, which in a few years died out, not because the Nonconformists acquiesced, but because they saw that time would adjust the grievance. Whilst the State had undertaken to maintain these schools it still refused to build them, and it demanded, in recognition, we suppose, of the State's generosity, that the owners should at their own cost keep the school buildings in a satisfactory state of repair. It was foreseen that in time many of these schools would be surrendered owing to the difficulty of finding money to repair the fabric. That has actually happened. An average taken over twenty-five years shows a decrease of 120 a year. So our grievance was adjusting itself. But the Anglican Church, which is mainly concerned, views this dwindling with dismay. Many of its leaders are determined to check it, and that is where the danger, or one of the dangers, of the present situation lies. It is important that we should know what is happening.

Sometime before 1923 there was formed, largely by the influence of the present Archbishop of York—then Bishop of Manchester—an "Association for the Defence of Church Schools". Amongst its objects are these :—

- (1) The retention, maintenance, and improvement of all existing Church Schools.
- (2) The preservation of the present system of Dual Control as the only guarantee for the training of children in the Church's faith.
- (3) To take all necessary steps to secure the providing of sufficient Church Schools in new districts.

This Association, which now has branches all over England, has raised large sums of money, but not nearly sufficient for its needs. However profoundly we may deprecate its aims and differ from its views of the function of national education, we must frankly admit that we can have no complaint against its methods, in the present state of the law. We lament the attempt to perpetuate the dual system; but it is at their own cost, by voluntary subscriptions, that these Anglicans are endeavouring to maintain their position. When, however, we read the reports of the speeches of some of their leaders at their Association Meetings, we cannot but be afraid of their influence. At a meeting in Manchester Dr. Temple said: "We have our Church Elementary Schools, we have our Church Secondary Schools, and we must have our Church Central Schools as well." At the establishment of the Birmingham branch in 1927 the Rev. Canon Thicknesse pointed out that the Church upheld an idea of education which was absolutely distinctive. If the Church of England gave up her schools there would be "two types of schools only — the *Roman Catholic Christian Schools and the secular schools*". The distinction, with its implied judgment of the Council schools, is worth noticing—the *Roman Catholic Christian* and the *secular*!

The leaders of the Anglican Church are keenly interested in education. September 15th last was appointed by the Archbishop of York as a day of special prayer in all churches in the province "to impress upon Church people the principles of Christian education and the concern which all Christians ought to feel for the progress of education generally". The subject is discussed at almost every Diocesan Conference, and strong committees are studying the problem and elaborating policies. As long ago as October, 1923, a Manchester Diocesan Committee, presided over by Dr. Temple, adopted an important "Memorandum on Religious Education". It endeavoured frankly to recognize and allow for our views, seemed to suggest that agreement was impossible, and urged the State to support two types of schools, denominational and undenominational.

Thus it pleaded for public money to build and support Church

Schools, the Diocesan authorities to retain control. Alternatively it asked for legislative provision to secure that when a voluntary school is transferred to the Local Authority denominational religious instruction should be given as before. There are suggestions also of right of entry and a type of ecclesiastical control.

In November, 1926, the Education Commission of the Church Assembly (the Bishop of Wakefield presiding), which had been studying the subject for several years, presented its "Third Report". Its demands were almost entirely reactionary. These are just a few of them, sufficient to show the trend :—

1. Denominational schools to be regarded equally with Council schools as part of the national system, and the State to give real security for their distinctive character.
2. Any Local Authority to be empowered to build, or aid in the building of, new denominational schools.
3. Managers (now independent bodies) to surrender to ecclesiastical authorities.

The demands of this more extreme section of the Anglican Church were voiced even more strongly at the Wakefield Diocesan Conference on 15th Oct. last, when the Diocesan Director of Religious Education (Canon W. J. Brown) urged in his Report that the bishops of the Church of England should "*go along with the Roman Catholics* and fight this battle together, to get a fair deal out of the Government both on the question of grants and religious teaching." Also on 17th Oct., at the Chelmsford Diocesan Conference, the Bishop of Chelmsford pleaded for a "direct grant" to Anglican Schools.

A few years ago in many counties attempts were made to compromise on the religious difficulties by means of what were called "concordats". These held some promise of facilitating the work of the Education Authorities, but the extravagant demands of the Anglicans have in almost every case killed them. I believe it is right to say that in no county is a concordat now working.

Another attempt to get over the difficulty was suggested by the Lancashire County Council Education Committee. It was that an Enabling Bill should be passed through Parliament to empower Local Education Authorities to make separate bargains with voluntary school managers for the taking over or the conditioning of their schools. This movement was opposed by Nonconformists, somewhat feebly, because of its confessed purpose of spending public money on denominational schools. It failed of acceptance, not, however, as a result of our half-hearted opposition, but because the Anglican Church again made such claims that Lord Eustace Percy, then President of the Board of Education, after having promised a qualified support, simply dared not consider it.

Aware of all these sectional movements one awaited with impatience the Report of the Archbishops' Commission, appointed, with Sir W. H. Hadow as Chairman, as long ago as 1924, to investigate the subject and make recommendations. The Report was published last October and forms a book of 195 pages. There is much in it with which Free Churchmen will heartily agree, and when it deals with controversial matters its language is conciliatory. But the recommendations are such that, if they were adopted, almost the whole of public education would be under Anglican control. Apparently some suggestions are similar to those made in the "Resolutions" of the Congregational Union; actually they do not seem to mean the same things. For example, it is urged that religious instruction should be entrusted to teachers adequately trained. But they emphasize that they mean teachers trained in specially equipped Anglican Training Colleges or under Anglican influences in the Universities, and upon whom, whether in Church or Council Schools, the Church may depend. They recommend the formulation of agreed syllabuses, to be prepared by Joint Committees representative of all denominations and the teaching profession; but at the same time they desire to preserve as many Church Schools as possible, where the religious instruction will be different. Thus they would influence the Council Schools as well as control their own. They recommend the retention of the Cowper Temple clause, not because they believe in it—on the contrary, its abandonment, to facilitate local agreements, would be "ideally the best solution"—but because its removal would "challenge almost unanimous opposition of Local Authorities and teachers". There is a proposal also for an alteration in the law, enabling the Board of Education to make special grants for the repair, enlargement, and equipment of Church Schools.

Behind the whole Report is the theory, against which Free Churchmen have always protested and must still protest, that national education is a service which the State should pay for and the Church control.

Thus the more moderate Majority Report. The Minority Report more drastically demands withdrawal of the Cowper Temple clause, building grants for non-provided schools, and the repeal of the regulations which govern religious instruction in the Secondary Schools.

These Reports were discussed by the Church Assembly on 15th Nov., 1929. The extremists were restive, but it was decided merely to receive the Reports and let the matter simmer until next spring. Two resolutions were unanimously adopted, one demanding assistance from public funds for non-provided schools, the other asking the Archbishops to appoint a committee to confer with the Government and the Associations of Local Education Authorities as to their re-organization policy and its effect on non-provided schools.

All the movements and agitations here reviewed are now therefore concentrated in a definite official attempt to overturn the settlement of 1902.

The activities of the Roman Catholics are perhaps even more threatening. It is well known that at the General Election nearly every candidate in the country was asked definitely to pledge himself to support the proposal to spend public money upon the building of new Roman Catholic Schools and the repair of existing ones, without any extension of public control. And Catholics were advised (and in at least some cases directed) to vote only for candidates whose answer was deemed satisfactory. It is not so generally known that they have for a number of years adopted the same tactics in many towns in municipal elections. By this means they hope to pack Local Education Authorities with their supporters.

Faced with the new proposals the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of England and Wales met on 14th Nov. last and unanimously passed a resolution that "The Bishops are of opinion that any grant given to Provided Schools to enable them to meet the requirements of the Board of Education should in equity be given also to the Non-Provided Schools".

This continual pressure by such powerful corporations as the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches has had a tremendous influence upon the Local Education Authorities, whose chief desire is to get on with the task of education. The result is that there are often obscure and secret negotiations between the Local Authorities and these Churches, by means of which a real revolution is being silently effected. The law is being strained or evaded. Occasionally the result comes to light, as in the case of the notorious "Dorset Letter", which was a deliberate offer on the part of the Board of Education to wink at, or even to further, an open breach of the "Cowper Temple" and the "Conscience" clauses of 1870 and to allow denominational teaching in a Council School. The "Playground Judgment" still stands—an equally ingenious "sanction" for spending public money on private premises, which arose out of a misleading "statement" supplied to the High Court by the Board, and a suppression of the appeal to a Higher Court when it was initiated. Thus the Local Education Authorities are being influenced.

The effect of these movements on the policy of the late Government was most marked. The closing of black-listed schools was slowed up, so that many which were condemned in 1924 are still in use. Before the general election, and as part of their election campaign, the Government developed truculent schemes of reaction to catch votes, threatening the Cowper Temple clause, showing many leanings towards ecclesiastical control and commercial control of the schools. They even promised a new Education Act which should provide for the repair and modernization of all black-listed school

buildings—a definite pledge to spend public money on privately-owned denominational school buildings.

But what of the present Government? It must not be forgotten that the public opinion which governments reflect is the opinion of which they are made most clearly aware. There are many members of Parliament to-day, both within and without the Government, who made definite pledges to the Roman Catholics at the election. For example, Bradford is represented by four Labour members, all of whom gained the Roman Catholic vote by making the pledge and publishing the fact. So reaction is well inside the House of Commons. It is urgently necessary that a strong counter-acting influence be brought to bear upon the Government from outside.

To return to the subject of the new situation in relation to further education. The Diocesan Authorities have welcomed the new proposals and have circularized the managers of the Anglican schools, urging them to further the plans of the "Hadow Report" as far as possible by the grouping of junior schools and the establishing of modern or central schools. They add, however, that influence should be exerted to ensure that the new modern schools—or a proportion of them—shall be "Church Schools".

This has been taking place ever since the Board of Education encouraged the formation of selective Central Schools, and what has already happened indicates what will be the general result. In forming a Central School the best building in the area has, of course, been chosen. This has generally been a Council School; in many places the only Council School available has been taken for this purpose, usually after secret negotiations with voluntary school managers. Parents and Nonconformists have seldom been consulted, and in many cases they have been surprised to find a new scheme ready made and adopted, by which all children under twelve are forced into Anglican Schools. In some cases Nonconformist opinion has been strong enough to defeat the scheme. But that has had a lamentable result in that these towns have been left without a desired Central School. Sometimes jealousy between a good Anglican school and an equally good Council school has made the Local Authority afraid to make the necessary advance.

But now there can be no further delay, since everywhere, if the Government's plans mature, the re-organization must take place. The situation bristles with difficulties. It is quite certain that the voluntary schools cannot meet the new demand. Nor can Free Churchmen, on the other hand, ignore the convinced belief of many in the Anglican Church in the denominational system. The Government has promised to increase the Treasury grant to Education Authorities for building schemes, during the next three years, from the present allowance of 20 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the total cost. The rest of the money will come from the rates. All the powerful

influences outlined above are being brought strongly to bear upon Parliament to allow part of that money to be spent on Anglican and Roman Catholic schools without any extension of public control or any diminution of denominational privilege. Sir Charles Trevelyan, President of the Board of Education, when introducing his new proposals to Parliament on 13th Nov., stated that he could not offer the building grants to voluntary schools unless there was a definite movement of agreement in the country. He pleaded for goodwill. "If," he said, "in Lancashire and Leicestershire and other places local authorities could get a settlement with goodwill on their part and on the part of the local clergy and the local bishop it could be done in the rest of England." But what are these agreements, and are Free Churchmen ever consulted? On one occasion, at least, when Diocesan representatives have held a lengthy conference, *in camera*, with a County Authority, it has been impossible to learn what transpired.

What ought Free Churchmen to do? First of all, they must assert afresh and firmly the principles for which they stand, and emphasize that they do so, not as denominationalists, but as citizens who believe that State Education can be really efficient only in so far as children are regarded simply as children of the State, without denominational distinction. Denominational teaching is the business of the Churches, for which the Churches should be prepared to pay and which should not encroach upon a national or State service. So it must be strongly urged:—

1. That education be developed promptly and maintained adequately on the lines of progress, popular control, and religious liberty.
2. That no new facilities for sectarian teaching be provided, and that the Cowper Temple Clause be strictly observed.
3. That public money shall be given as building grants only for premises to be owned and controlled by a Public Authority.

Also they must be on the alert to guard against new agreements being imposed upon any area without the consent of Free Churchmen, and to insist on the Free Churches being definitely represented, whenever negotiations are undertaken with a view to re-organization.

It is not enough merely to protest. We must endeavour to find an agreed solution. Many influential leaders of the Anglican Church are anxious to find a way satisfactory to all, and are not likely to be led away by their extremists. Hopeful lines of approach would be to canvass further the possibilities of an agreed syllabus of religious instruction in every area, to apply to all schools alike; also to discuss the matter of facilities for the training of teachers in Biblical scholarship, of course without sectarian or ecclesiastical tests.

But nothing can be done without definite and concerted study and

effort. I would urge that the time has come for a really strong committee to be formed, such as that appointed by the Anglicans at the Church Assembly, and for the same purpose, "to confer with the Government and the Associations of Local Education Authorities as to their re-organization policy". This should be done at once. It should be a committee that would stand comparison with that of the Archbishops and command as much respect in Parliamentary quarters. Thus we should bring the force of Free Church opinion to bear upon the Government and the State. If the Free Churches do not take action soon, they may find themselves again, as in 1902, with a settlement, agreed between Parliament and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches, imposed upon them, and again dignified with the pseudonym "compromise".

Such a committee would not be without external support. The Free Churches do not stand alone. Most educational experts—amongst them many Anglicans—and probably the whole body of the teaching profession would support the demand for a free, unified, and unsectarian system.

D. S. JOHNS.

ENGLAND'S INDEBTEDNESS TO NONCONFORMITY MUSICALLY

UPON the ears of many otherwise well-informed readers the title of this paper will fall with a peculiar and unaccustomed sound. Theologically, politically, and socially, the enormous indebtedness of England to Nonconformity has been generally acknowledged by impartial historians, although, at times, grudgingly and, in some cases, ungraciously. On the other hand, however, the connexion between Nonconformity and music is one which has been practically ignored by Free Church historians, and woefully misrepresented by the majority of musical writers. Of these regrettable facts the second is not so surprising when we remember that many histories of English music have been written by men whose ecclesiastical and political opinions were in direct opposition to those commonly held by Free Churchmen. Other writers who conscientiously endeavoured to distinguish between history and propaganda could not possibly be in possession of facts revealed by recent research.

To set down as the first instalment of England's musical indebtedness to Nonconformity any portion of the labours of the travelling preachers who, in the 14th century, were "sent forth to minister" by that first great English Dissenter from the Roman heresy, John Wycliffe, would be to base a claim upon an etymological rather than upon an historical foundation, since the only proof we have that the Lollards sang as they taught is the supposed derivation of their distinctive name from the old German *lollen*, to sing soothingly, and *hard*, a common affix of that period. But whatever songs they may have sung were silenced in the priestly persecutions under the fourth and fifth Henrys, and two centuries elapsed before the occurrence of any important musical event in which conscientious objectors to Popery or Episcopacy participated. Then it was that there returned to their native country numbers of English Protestants who, in Germany, Holland, and Geneva, had found refuge from the storms of the Marian persecution. These good people brought with them many Genevan tunes, such as the *Old 100th*, *Toulon*, and (possibly) *St. Michael's*; also others, such as the *Old 104th*, which latter tunes were probably the productions of certain musicians, unknown to fame, who were included in the "goodly company" of the Protestant refugees.

But, although amongst the returning exiles there were to be found many men afterwards prominent in their opposition to Episcopacy, it would be an anachronism to claim the musical efforts of any such as constituting definite evidence of England's indebtedness to Nonconformity musically. As a whole the early Puritans were not Nonconformists. They endeavoured to reform the State

Church from within. With the "schism" of the Brownists, as the Congregationalists were first called, they had as little sympathy as with the "heresy" of the Anabaptists. To liberty of conscience they were strangers. Indeed it was not until after 1662, when 2,000 clergymen vacated their livings rather than submit to the notorious Act of Uniformity, that the Nonconformists and the Puritans became one. Nor were the Presbyterians of the 17th century really Nonconformists. On the contrary, their efforts were directed towards the imposition upon the nation of the Solemn League and Covenant instead of the Prayer Book and the Thirty-Nine Articles.

To most readers of this article the foregoing facts are probably familiar. Their recital, however, is necessary in order to enable us to understand the position of affairs in 1644, when there was issued the Parliamentary "ordinance" decreeing the defacement of images and the demolition of organs "in all churches and chapells". Here the motive power was largely the Presbyterian dislike of the "kist o' whistles". As usual, Cromwell and the Nonconformists generally have been credited with this act of vandalism; but, as that able historian, Mr. Henry Davey, remarks, "Nearly all the damage was wrought in 1642, when Cromwell was only a captain over 60 horse, a man unknown to public fame and quite uninfluential." Prejudiced propagandists have endeavoured to make capital out of the manner in which the "ordinance" was carried out. In this respect they have over-reached themselves, as the Ironsides of Cromwell were too sober and godly a set of men to "break down the organs and pawn the pipes at several ale-houses for pots of ale". The destruction of organs, in all probability, was carried out by that human scum and wreckage which always hangs about the rear of a military force. Possibly, too, these vandals were countenanced or assisted by men who had suffered in person and estate for their religious and political principles—wise men driven mad by oppression—who now deemed they were doing God good service by destroying everything which might remind them of the regal and ecclesiastical tyranny to which they had been subjected. The organ had been a prominent participant in the Popish service and in the ritualistic ceremonies of Laud. Hence the Puritans declined to tolerate it. Music and its chief exponent suffered on account of abhorrent associations.

But all the doomed organs were not destroyed. St. Paul's, York, Durham, and Lincoln Cathedrals retained their instruments. The organ of Magdalen College was "removed to Hampton Court, and frequently played upon to Cromwell's great content". This, however, not until after 1654, as in July of that year Evelyn heard it at Oxford, manipulated by Christopher Gibbons, son of the illustrious Orlando. Probably, as Dr. Rimbault remarks, its removal was due to "some amicable arrangement between Cromwell and the President and Fellows".

Nor was the "destruction" of organs an altogether unmixed evil. Neither was it one of such magnitude as our modern ideas of organ distribution and dimension would lead us to believe. In the earlier half of the 17th century organs in England were not as plentiful as blackberries in autumn: only the cathedrals and larger parish churches could boast of their possession. Of these instruments the majority were very small: many possessed but one manual; practically none had pedals or pedal pipes. Also their use was not to accompany congregational singing but to add brilliancy by the addition of "all possible embellishments by means of florid runs"—as Dr. Barrett says, "not unlike the extemporaneous descant in which country organists were wont to indulge many years back while accompanying the chants and psalms". To that style of music, said Mr. Davey, "the Puritans objected; and so should we object if we heard it now", only, instead of destroying the instrument, we should give the organist notice to quit. So then, if the Nonconformists of the Protectorate period united with the Puritans and the Presbyterians in the removal of the unmusical absurdities above mentioned, they certainly did more good than harm in this respect. Only to their method of reformation should exception be taken.

In his thesis on *Milton's Knowledge of Music*, Dr. S. G. Spaeth asserts that "the attack upon ecclesiastical music strengthened the interest in secular music, and its popularity increased rather than diminished". The reality of this revival is proved by the fact that, according to Mr. Andrew Deakin's *Musical Bibliography*, more music and musical works were published during the Protectorate than in the whole reign of Charles I. Also Milton states that in the London of his day lutes, viols, and guitars were to be found "in every house". Hence Mr. Davey declares that to speak of music *per se* as being prohibited or even discouraged during the Commonwealth is "absolute and unqualified falsehood". And the leading Nonconformists were the greatest music lovers of that time. Thus we find Cromwell engaging John Hingston to be his private organist at a salary of £100 *per annum*; and even that biased and bullying Middlesex magistrate, Sir John Hawkins, in his monumental *History of Music*, of 1776, bears testimony not only to Oliver's love of music but to his personal interest in musicians, for he made good the salaries of some of those who had lost their appointments owing to the abolition of the cathedral service. On festive occasions during the Protectorate music was always in evidence, Cromwell considering music and dancing to be "very good diversions". Even at his funeral there was music rendered by "two lads brought up to music" and eight singing men, as Mr. Joseph Bennett remarks, "a notable body of artists for those times". Prior to this—in February, 1666—Hingston and others petitioned Cromwell's Council "that there be a Corporation or College of Musicians created in London, with reason-

able powers to read and practice publicly all sorts of Musick". The "petition" was favourably entertained, and a committee appointed to "receive any addresses that shall be made to them, in order to ye advancement of Musick, and to report to ye Counsell as they shall have cause". The death of Cromwell put a stop to any further action: otherwise we might have been indebted to Nonconformity for the establishment of the first English College of Music. Instead of which a century and a half elapsed before the establishment of the Royal Academy of Music as a "proprietary" school of the then Duke of Westmoreland.

Amongst other prominent Nonconformists to whom we are indebted musically, mention should be made of Colonel Hutchinson, the Baptist, a man described by his wife as one who "could dance admirably, had great love for music, and often diverted himself with a viol on which he played masterly", possessing "an exact ear and judgment in other music". Milton, who, if anything denominationally, was a Congregationalist, was not only a lover of music, as is proved by his poems *At a Solemn Music* and *Il Penseroso*, and from the frequent references to music in his works, but he was a well-trained and skilful performer. During his closing years he is said to have played for an hour daily on either the organ or the viol, while even his final illness was soothed by song.

During the Parliamentary regime music makings in London and Oxford were fairly numerous. Cromwell's attendance at the former is certified by statements (too lengthy for quotation here) which were made by Sir Roger L'Estrange, a noted performer on the viols and, after the Restoration, licenser of musical publications. A long list of musicians participating in the Oxford concerts is mentioned by Anthony Wood, its reproduction in Hawkins's history occupying four or five pages. Wood also states that amongst the Oxford amateurs Thomas Ken "would be sometimes amongst them and sing his part". This fact one of Ken's biographers advances as "a proof that love of music overpasses religious divisions".

Lastly, incredible as it may seem, it is to that period of the Protectorate in which the Nonconformist element predominated that we are indebted for the production of the first real English opera. This work was entitled *The Siege of Rhodes*, and consisted of five acts, the libretto being written by Sir William Davenant, to whom Cromwell granted a special licence for its performance at Rutland House, Aldersgate Street, on 23rd May, 1656. Unfortunately the music, said to have been largely recitative, has disappeared. In his *Foundations of English Opera* Mr. E. J. Dent speaks of the Protectorate as "the only period at which serious opera in English, set to music all through . . . has ever enjoyed a real and supreme popularity with English audiences". Sir George Macfarren, in his paper on *The Lyrical Drama*, read before the Musical Association

on 7th June, 1880, says that "in the principal character (of *The Siege of Rhodes*) the first female performer that was ever heard upon the English stage sustained a part—Mrs. Coleman, the wife of Dr. Coleman", who, with Milton's friend, Harry Lawes, the hero of one of the poet's sonnets, composed some portion of the music. Thus, says the worthy Cambridge professor, "from the Puritan time in England dates the opening of the English opera, and that very important introduction into musical performances, the beautiful sound of the female voice". In 1658 Davenant produced *The Spaniards in Peru*, a work which was said to have been encouraged by Cromwell, "who was then supposed to be meditating some designs against the Spaniards". This opera was followed, in 1659, by *The History of Sir Francis Drake*. There was also a daily performance of opera in London during the latter period of the Protectorate.

After the Restoration and the passing of the Act of Uniformity, the iniquitous legislation embodied in such measures as the Corporation, the Conventicle, the Five-Mile, and the Test Acts prevented for nearly a century further musical developments among the Nonconformists. Liable, at first, to arrest at any moment of their worship, they met by stealth, carefully avoiding any sounds calculated to betray the existence of an unlawful assembly. But it was during this period that we are indebted to Bunyan for the delightful references to music in his "immortal allegory". Indeed, so great was his affection for music that he is said to have fashioned a flute out of one of the legs of a chair in Bedford jail. The exclusion of Free Churchmen from all public offices and from the Universities, the death of the old leaders such as Owen and Howe, together with the narrowness of the then rising ministers, lowered the intellectual status of Nonconformity and made it unpopular with the higher classes of society. "Of Christian song, as an art, they knew little or nothing," says Skeats: "They did sing, but only a rough and uncouth doggerel."

Nevertheless, in the midst of this political, intellectual, and artistic darkness there arose a burning and a shining light, a man through whose labours Nonconformity was able to confer upon the worship music of this country one of the greatest benefits it has ever received. "On the day of the death of William III, Isaac Watts, then only twenty-seven years of age, was chosen to fill the pulpit of Mark Lane Chapel, London," formerly occupied by John Owen. Five years later (1707) Watts published his first collection of hymns, some of which had been already sung in his father's church at Southampton. His *Psalms* followed in 1719. The State Church clung to the "dry psalter" of Tate and Brady until the middle of the last century; but "the English Independents", says Lord Selborne, "as represented by Dr. Watts, have a just claim to be considered the real founders of modern hymnology". As Mr. J. T. Lightwood

remarks, "The introduction of the hymn as a substitute for the metrical psalms, under the influence of Dr. Watts, marks the turn of the tide. The outbursts of song which characterized the Methodist movement brought in the flood."

But Watts was more than a poet, and more than a pioneer. He was an unconscious prophet. Challenged in 1696, by his father's church, to produce something better than the hymns of the Rev. W. Barton (1603-78) of which he had been complaining, Watts wrote—and his words were "lined out" and sung the same day at evening service—the hymn commencing,

Behold the glories of the Lamb,
Amidst His Father's throne;
Prepare new honours for his name,
And songs before unknown.

To this preparation of "new honours" and "songs before unknown" Watts was contributing to an extent of which he had little or no idea, for the new hymns were soon found to require special tunes. The poetical flights of Watts, and, in later years, of Wesley, could not be restricted to the metres of the old "Church Tunes" of Reformation times. Thus it came to pass that England became still further indebted to Nonconformity musically, for Nonconformist musicians contributed some of the finest of our older hymn tunes. Amongst the latter was the immortal *Miles Lane*, composed by William Shrubsole, a chorister of Canterbury Cathedral, who, in 1783, was dismissed from his post as organist of Bangor Cathedral on a charge of "frequenting conventicles". He became organist of Spa Fields Chapel in 1784, died in 1806, and was buried in Bunhill Fields where a monument, erected through the exertions of Mr. F. G. Edwards, the late editor of *The Musical Times*, marks his grave. Another composer was Isaac Smith, sometime clerk of Ayliffe Street Meeting House, London, who died about 1800, and is best known to us as the composer of *Abridge* and, perhaps, of *Irish*. Thomas Olivers (1725-1809), the profligate shoemaker of a Montgomeryshire village, a convert of Whitefield, and one of Wesley's itinerant preachers, will not only be remembered as the author of that magnificent hymn, "The God of Abraham praise," but as the composer of the melody of *Helmsley*, the tune almost inseparably joined to the Advent hymn, "Lo! He comes with clouds descending". "Holy Bible, Book divine," was written by a Congregational minister, Joseph Hart: *Hart*, to which the words are generally sung, was composed by Benjamin Milgrove (1731-1810), sometime precentor of the Countess of Huntington's Church, Bath, and known locally as "the musical doll-man" from the fact that he kept a toy-shop in his native city.

To the Unitarians we are indebted for *Warrington*—still a favourite L.M. tune with many editors and congregations—the composition of the Rev. Ralph Harrison, the minister of Cross Street

Unitarian Chapel, Manchester, from 1777 until his death in 1810. Amongst other Nonconformist musicians of this period to whose efforts we owe many hymn tunes characteristic of their time may be mentioned James Leach (1762-98), the Methodist musician of Rochdale and Salford, whose tunes were very highly esteemed by that great organ virtuoso, W. T. Best; Isaac Tucker (1761-1825), the Baptist precentor of Westbury Leigh, in Wiltshire, the composer of *Devizes*; William Arnold (1768-1832), a Portsmouth shipwright, the composer of *Sarah*; Samuel Stanley (1767-1822), of Carrs Lane and Ebenezer Chapel, Birmingham, the composer of *Shirland* and *Calvary*; the Northamptonshire Baptist, Thomas Jarman (1788-1862), the composer of *Nativity*; the Lancashire Methodist, James Ellor (b. 1819), the composer of *Diadem*; Thomas Clark, of Canterbury, who, in 1837, edited the *Union Tune Book*, for many years the standard book of psalmody amongst Nonconformists; and many other musicians, amongst whom we must not forget to mention George Gay, the Wiltshire stonemason (1771-1833), who, not content with building a country Congregational chapel in addition to Melksham Bridge, and acting as organist of the Congregational Church, Corsham, constructed organs, wrote poetry, composed some fine hymn tunes and some anthems (one hymn tune being in eight real parts), and acted as musical editor of *Hawkes' Tunes*, of 1832, one of the most representative collections of West country tunes known at that period, and one which cost its Methodist proprietor over £500.

Owing to the struggles and difficulties of the Nonconformist churches of the 18th and earlier part of the 19th centuries, it was not until the latter decades of the 19th that provincial Free Churches were able to secure professional leadership for their service of praise. Consequently the direction of their worship music devolved upon amateurs, many of them in comparatively humble life, as indicated in the preceding paragraph. What these practically self-taught musicians did for themselves and for others almost surpasses credence. Through their agency thousands of young people studied musical notation and part-singing, or obtained an elementary knowledge of a stringed or wind instrument sufficient to enable them to take their part in psalmody or simple anthems; while others essayed even psalmodic composition which proved to be well up to the average of their time. Thus, to the provincial Nonconformist churches of the century following the Methodist revival we are indebted for the greater part of the musical education of large numbers of the young people of that period.

The mention of elementary musical training should serve to remind us that it is to that highly esteemed Congregational minister, the Rev. John Curwen (1816-80), that we owe the establishment of that singularly simple system of sight-singing known as the Tonic

Sol-fa, to which is due a very large portion of any credit we may now possess as a nation of sight singers and expert choralists. Nor should we forget the efforts made by a blind Congregational minister, John James Waite (*d.* 1868) whose sight-singing systems by means of numbers, although superseded by that of Curwen, did much good work in a more limited sphere. Waite's tune book, the *Hallelujah* (1842), was originally edited by James Foster, organist of Whitefield's Tabernacle, Bristol. To it we are indebted for the first appearance of Foster's fine tune, *Pembroke*.

This leads us naturally to our next claim for Nonconformity musically, namely, that to it we are beholden for some of the most interesting and valuable collections of hymn tunes ever published in this country. Those of Hawkes and Waite have already been mentioned; but an earlier Nonconformist tune-book was Dr. Rippon's *Selection of Psalm and Hymn Tunes* of 1795, the 13th edition of which appeared in 1820. That Dr. Rippon (1751-1836) was a Baptist minister is well known; but it is not so well known that his "selection" was the first attempt to find tunes for Dr. Watts's *Hymns and Psalms*, and that it was probably the first book of its kind to have marks of expression inserted in the music. Another interesting method of expressing psalmodic tone gradation was that featured by the Rev. John Curwen in his *Sabbath Hymn Book* of 1859. Here the lines supposed to demand a larger tone in their musical rendering were printed in capital letters; the supposed softer passages, in italics. After the *Union Tune Book*, already mentioned, came Dr. Allon's *Congregational Psalmist*, the *Bristol Tune Book*, *Church Praise*, the *Congregational Church Hymnal*, the Rev. Garrett Horder's *Worship Song*, and last of all, and probably the best, the *Congregational Hymnary*. This is a lengthy list, but it lacks the redeeming virtue of a catalogue in that it is by no means complete. Indeed it only refers to a portion, considerable though it may be, of the hymnals for which we are indebted to Nonconformists.

If it is denominationally correct to speak of Surrey Chapel, during the ministry of the Rev. Rowland Hill, as a Nonconformist place of worship, we can then claim for Nonconformity the credit of the establishment (if not the inauguration) of organ recitals in this country, together with the first presentation of Bach's organ works to an English audience. This took place in 1808, when the organist of Surrey Chapel, Shrubsole's pupil, Benjamin Jacob (1778-1829), in his day one of the most celebrated English organists, began a series of organ "performances" which commenced at 11 a.m. and lasted for four hours. In these efforts he was assisted by Dr. Crotch and, more especially, by Samuel Wesley, the son of Charles Wesley, the poet, and the father of Dr. S. S. Wesley, the celebrated cathedral organist and church composer. At these "recitals" many of Bach's works were heard for the first time in England; and with reference

thereto a remarkable series of letters was written by Wesley to Jacob, in one of which Wesley speaks of being grateful to Rowland Hill for granting the use of the building and of thinking him (Wesley) worthy to be joint organist with Jacob. The attention attracted to Bach's works by these performances and the part Rowland Hill and his people played in rendering the recitals possible are matters of interest and importance to all English organists and students of musical history.

Then, in addition to organ music and performances, Englishmen are indebted to Free Church generosity and enterprise for some of the finest organs to be found in this country, as can easily be demonstrated by reference to the specifications of Nonconformist organs to be found in the pages of musical journals of recent date. The same applies to organ recitals. Indeed, Mr. F. G. Edwards has shewn that it was at Union Chapel, Islington, on 4th December, 1867, that the expression "organ recital" was substituted for the more cumbersome one of "organ performance", the performer on that occasion being no less a personage than W. T. Best himself.

Nor is this country indebted to Nonconformity for musical *material* alone. The Free Churches have provided *men*, her "chief musicians"—in addition to those already mentioned—including the names of hundreds of organists, choirmasters, composers, conductors, and teachers of fully recognized ability. For instance, as editors we have Mr. Josiah Booth, the editor of the *Congregational Church Hymnal* and of the chant, anthem, and service section of the *Bristol Tune Book*; Mr. Arthur Berridge, the editor of *Worship Song*; the late Mr. F. G. Edwards, the editor of *Church Praise*, and also of *The Musical Times*; his successor, the late Dr. McNaught, the great choral adjudicator; Mr. Ebenezer Minshall, the founder and editor of *The Musical Journal*; and Mr. J. Spencer Curwen, sometime editor of *The Musical Herald*. Then, as theorists, we have Professor Prout, in his day one of the foremost theorists in Europe or America; and the late Mr. Henry Banister who, up to the time of his death, was the deacon of a Nonconformist church and an occasional local preacher, his grandfather, C. W. Banister (1768-1831) having been the precentor of a London Baptist church and a composer still remembered by his stirring hymn tune, *Dunkirk*, and by his once favourite anthem, *Avon*, a setting of Toplady's lines, "At anchor laid, remote from home".

A further musical indebtedness to Nonconformity is in the direction of Free Church musical and choral societies, such as the Nonconformist Choir Union and the various Nonconformist choral organizations, which are to be found in every town or district of importance throughout the country. In this connexion should be mentioned the fact that one of the greatest choral conductors and adjudicators of recent years, Sir Henry Coward, is a lifelong Non-

conformist and Free Church official. Further, we are indebted to the Free Churches for, practically, the establishment of the mixed choir and, certainly, for its continuance. However much other denominations may divide the sexes, the Free Churches are, and should always be, too chivalrous to exclude women from their choirs or to assign them a subordinate position therein, and too artistic to ignore so beautiful and characteristic a musical effect as that produced by the female voice singly or in combination. Indeed, much of the success of our best choral societies, festival choruses, and competition choirs is due to the presence therein of choralists trained under Free Church auspices. If these contingents were withdrawn the loss in volume and effect would be, to say the least, lamentable.

Lastly, if congregational singing is to be regarded as a musical desideratum, then great indeed is our indebtedness to Nonconformity in this respect. For the importance of united praise was proclaimed by those fathers of Congregationalism, Ainsworth and Robinson; was encouraged by Baxter, the Presbyterian, by Keach, the Baptist, by the founder of Methodism, and by many other Nonconformist divines; and was established by the labours of such men as Wesley, Smith, Rippon, Allon, Curwen, Feaston, Minshall, and many other Free Church musical writers and musicians both past and present.

In fact so much could be said concerning our stated subject that this article could easily be expanded into a volume. Sufficient, however, has been set down, not in the nature of propaganda but in the interests of authentic musical history, to show that no one who claims any adequate knowledge of the latter subject can venture to assert that Nonconformity has had no lot or part whatever in the building up of the musical life of the nation. On the contrary, even this imperfect survey should be equal to the task of demonstrating that Nonconformity's share in England's musical life has been neither inconsiderable nor immaterial. This being admitted, it follows that if our Nonconformist musical ancestors, labouring under almost indescribable difficulties and discouragements, produced such wonderful results musically and left so fine a record upon the pages of musical history, the least that can be expected of their present day representatives is that they should not be stationary but go forward, as John Robinson, the pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers once expressed it, "further than the instruments of our reformation," always remembering that musically as well as spiritually "unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more".

ORLANDO A. MANSFIELD.

“JESUS NAZARENUS.”

A LARGE number of books have been written, and we suppose will continue to be written, upon what Jesus said or did, or upon what Jesus was, according to the situation or inclination of the author—but few about Jesus. Lives of Jesus have also been many, but few have suited the minds of the common people who heard Him gladly. They have been rather “introductions” to Jesus. As an occasional event, a story of the Cross has been a best seller, but none has remained. *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, which is about the Lord of the Hill, defies the fate of its competitors. The modern age would gladly receive a book about Jesus. Whatever priest or minister might say, each man has his own secret thoughts about Him and also his own portrait; there is nothing, in fact, that he has which is so specifically his own. Men would, however, welcome the artist who would do for them what the author of the Fourth Gospel did for the lovers of Jesus in the second century or what the author of the *Imitation* did for his own romantic age, or what the author of the *Hebrews* did for his friends who found vision and faith fading. These all wrote about Jesus, but the one followed Him into the camp of His bitterest enemies, the other followed, to use his own words, “to the ignominy of His Cross,” and who can tell what awaited the author who dared to write about a High Priest who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities, or about Jesus as the author and perfecter of faith?

Yet, perhaps the greatness of the task, and the danger it presupposes, accounts for the fact that few write about Jesus. History records the fate of a young man of twenty-four, David Friedrich Strauss, who ventured to write about Him, and against whom the heavy artillery of men less brave than he was quickly ranged. No one seeks his fate, though it might do the Church good if some brave and peerless soul would write about Jesus, if he would give us his own thoughts and would speak out of his own feelings. It might endanger, in the minds of the fearful, the safety of the citadel of faith, but then men might be enticed away from discussing accessories, secondaries, “Orders of Service,” and such questions as “if Christ came to London”; and in the war of words and countless theories that might follow some would find that the great thing after all is the desire to see Jesus, a request as old as the coming of the Greeks. The sure and certain fact would be that a book about Jesus would say so many disturbing things that the author could not escape an encircling attack; for we should find him reminding us that no distinctions that men seek after were found in Him, that He came from a despised northern village, that He was a Galilean, from which province no prophet ever came, and quite likely spoke with “an accent.”

In any books of this kind and nature, whatever their tincture of orthodoxy might be, there would be one piece of solid and sure ground common to all; they would agree that nothing matters save Jesus, Jesus only. The story of Jesus of Nazareth we have wants us to know this very thing. It relates why God sent His Son, and sent Him to a people that was despised and rejected of men, a people of sorrows and acquainted with grief. This people was chosen out of all the greater peoples of the world. He sent Him to the north into a working man's family. He never possessed any adornment, any robe of office. When He died, He died as a malefactor among malefactors, and "a seamless robe" was the only possession over which there was any danger of a dispute amongst the soldiers as to who should possess it. This surely means that God meant that nothing was of greater moment than Jesus Himself, and so planned His mission that the simplest mind should make no mistake. Nothing in after years remained so vividly in the memory of three of the disciples as that occasion when, "lifting up their eyes, they saw no one, save Jesus only." Their companions in fellowship with Jesus were at the same time occupied with a very mundane question; similar questions remain and to many are of grave and great importance.

The question then is whether this age has not lost Jesus of Nazareth, and so lost the heart of God. Something like this loss can be detected in the names we accept from tradition, names which He Himself would most likely have challenged. We call Him "Prince," but He was one of the brethren; we make Him a King, an honour He was careful to evade; we have made Him a High Priest, whereas He regarded Himself as a servant. The mistake is that we read into these names meanings which are our own, and not in keeping with Him Who proclaimed the Beatitudes. Is this procedure, however, part of a conspiracy to lift Jesus out of the humbler surroundings and circumstances into which He was sent, out of the perfectly natural atmosphere in which He lived? The aim of such a conspiracy would doubtless be that He might find favour with kings, emperors, and popes, and, further, to justify those who seek the favours and honours of the world. That is, men have attempted to lift Jesus up to man's own level of social eminence and ambition rather than that men should humble themselves and descend to where He stands. But He persists in remaining the Nazarene. So we have lost Him.

The coming event then may well be the re-discovery of Jesus of Nazareth. The world might appear to many as being prepared for this great event. The decline is not in an appreciation of religion, but in a loss of confidence in the modern organized forms of religion. The Church, with its many sections, has argued itself into an impasse from which there seems at present no escape except by retreat. In the confusion of claims some are sighing for a Francis to show us in

life the art of true living; some for a Fénelon "who in the ante-chamber of despotic power meditated upon the institutions of liberty, and though destined to improve courts and instruct monarchs, desired only to civilize savages in the solitudes around Lake Huron." Others look for someone who will do what Luther did for his century, though he must commence with a different thesis, and one equal to the expectations of our day, namely, "the freedom with which Christ sets us free." This is the very heart of the Gospel. It is very hard, however, to admit that "our systems," built up with such labour and fortitude of faith, must eventually pass. But the counterpart is seen in looking over a theological library that is fifty years old. The books have passed. Yet what labour they represent, how eagerly they were read, one here or there was a great event. So must pass our opinions, our doctrines, even our creeds; but Jesus of Nazareth will remain.

The retreat then would be along our individual path back to Him from Whom we set out. The quest of Jesus of Nazareth has still a charm for many minds, and when man's understanding has been fully granted its freedom, the writer about Jesus will arrive. So many things have been said, so many schemes of salvation have been advanced, so many sermons have been preached about how to become a follower of Jesus, but little, after centuries, has been attained of clear and lasting success, and recently a great shattering has taken place. It is high time now bravely to speak about Jesus, the author and finisher of the faith that alone will save the world. One thing the coming prophet will surely speak to his age. He will try, among other things, to tell us what it feels like to be a Christian, to possess that spirit which makes men free. The apostle who had known what it felt like to be alive apart from the law, and what it felt like to be a Pharisee, told his hearers what it felt like to be a Christian; he had one text and that was a text about Jesus; he preached Christ and Him crucified. "We live in thoughts and feelings," says W. H. Hudson; it is surely true. Mr. Masfield in *The Everlasting Mercy* has beautifully expressed this experience of what it feels like to be a Christian, and seems in fact to suggest that he who will write about Jesus will be a poet:—

O lovely lily clean,
O lily springing green,
O lily bursting white,
Dear lily of delight,
Spring in my heart agen
That I may flower to men.

C. MORELL BAINTON.

THE LAST SUPPER.

Paul in <i>1 Cor.</i> 11 23-26.	<i>Mark</i> 14 22-23	<i>Luke</i> 22 15-20.	<i>John.</i>
(23) For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; (24) and when he had given thanks he brake it and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. (25) In like manner also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. (26) For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.	(22) And as they were eating he took bread, and when he had blessed he brake it and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. (23) And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave to them: and they all drank of it. (24) And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. (25) Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.	(15) And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: (16) for I say unto you, I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God. (17) And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, Take this and divide it among yourselves: (18) for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the Kingdom of God shall come. (19) And he took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it and gave to them, saying, This is my body [which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. (20) And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you]1.	<i>John</i> xiii (1) Now before the feast of the passover, Jesus knowing that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. (2) And during supper (then follows the story of the feet-washing, without allusion to the bread and wine). <i>John</i> vi (51) I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world. (52) The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? (53) Jesus therefore said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. . . . (63) It is the spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.

1. The "Western" Text (Codex Bezae and the Old Latin) omits passage in square brackets.

MANY volumes have been written concerning the meal shared by our Lord with His disciples on the night of His betrayal, which in Christian tradition marks the initiation of the Church's most solemn rite. The words and acts ascribed to Jesus have been examined with the utmost minuteness, and pondered with the most scrupulous care. Yet, after all, there is divergence among students as to what actually took place, and what were the thoughts and intentions of the Master. The traditional view of this great historic moment is by no means universally accepted; and perhaps there is room for a layman's humble attempt to survey afresh the existing evidence.

1.

There appear to be four sources of information, largely independent of one another, which are set out above in parallel columns. They are the accounts given by Paul, by *Mark*, by *Luke*, and by the author of the fourth Gospel. That in the first Gospel is not here

printed, being an almost literal reproduction of the story contained in *Mark*.

Before I proceed to compare them with one another there is a preliminary question to be considered, because the interpretation of the passages depends in part on the answer we give to it. *Was this meal a Passover?* The Synoptists write as if they thought it was; Jesus sends two of His disciples to "make ready the passover".¹ But it is well known that a number of their statements appear inconsistent with this view—e.g., the Sanhedrin had determined to arrest Him and get Him put to death *before* the "feast"²—and that the fourth Gospel consistently places the Supper on the day before the passover, making the latter coincide with the death of Jesus. On the whole, I incline to the view suggested by Prof. F. C. Burkitt (and perhaps others) that Jesus intended, and earnestly desired,³ to celebrate the passover with His disciples, but found that owing to the treachery of Judas He would not be left at liberty to do so. There was time, however, for a farewell supper, and this opportunity He eagerly seized, anticipating by one day the regular celebration. If this is probably true, we need not seek to explain His words and acts by supposing that they would accord minutely with the paschal ritual; and no use will be made of this in what follows.

Our two chief authorities for what occurred at the Supper are Paul and *Mark*. Paul introduces his narrative by saying that he "received" it "of the Lord". No one, I think, has explained satisfactorily what he means by this. If he is claiming a direct revelation to himself of a fact in history, this would be unique in his recorded experience; and even so we might still be doubtful whether he remembered it correctly in every detail. It seems to me more likely that he is giving to the Corinthian Church the Christian tradition as he had received it, and supporting it by what to him is an inward intuition of its truth.⁴ Neither he nor Mark can have been present at the Supper; but Mark's Gospel is commonly believed to have rested in part on the recollections of Peter, who certainly was there. The two authorities agree about the bread: that Jesus, after a solemn thanksgiving, broke a loaf and gave portions to the disciples with the words "This is my body". They also agree about the cup: with minor divergencies of phrasing both authorities give us, in reference to its contents, the words "my blood", and "the (new) covenant". Where they differ is in Paul's twice repeated "this do", which does not appear in *Mark* at all—a very important divergence, needing further consideration. They also differ widely in the words that

¹ Mk. 14¹²⁻¹⁶.

² Mk. 14¹¹.

³ Luke 22¹⁵.

⁴ Compare his *παρέλαβον* and *παρέδωκα* with the same words in 1. Cor. 15³: "I delivered unto you that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

follow, the only common feature being an eschatological outlook: "till He come" in Paul, the proximity of "the kingdom of God" in *Mark*.

The chief difficulty of the passage in *Luke* is to know how much is original. All the words after "This is my body" are omitted by the "Western" text of *Luke*, and Westcott and Hort left them out of their text. These words (*i.e.*, verses 19b and 20), containing the only "this do" in the Gospels, have apparently been inserted from 1 *Cor.* 11²⁴ (conceivably by Luke himself, in a later edition of his Gospel); and if that is their source they do not give us *independent* support of Paul's version of what occurred. But, if these portions are omitted, it is not easy for 19a to stand. The mention of the bread then looks like an after-thought, and "this is my body" remains isolated, without logical connexion with preceding or following verses. So that we may be compelled, with Wellhausen, to strike it also out of the original *Luke*. Without it, verses 15-18 form a compact whole, a striking version of the occurrence different from either Paul's or *Mark*'s, which (according to Streeter¹) Luke derived from his original source, "Proto-Luke". It is markedly eschatological in character—the general significance being that Jesus, knowing it is now too late to share the passover meal with His disciples, looks forward with confidence to the ideal Messianic banquet in the Kingdom which is close at hand. The passage, thus restricted, contains no mention either of the body or of the blood of Jesus; yet it is full of anticipation of His immediate death.

The fourth Gospel goes further than "Proto-Luke", and omits all mention of the bread and wine. Instead of this we are told that "during supper" (which the author is at pains to say took place "before the feast") Jesus washes the disciples' feet. This may well be historical, and is possibly alluded to in *Luke* 22²⁷, "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth". The omission of the Eucharist seems inexplicable, unless the author wished in this way to combat views concerning it which were already gaining ground in the Church, and of which he disapproved. That its symbolism deeply appealed to him is clear from the discourse which in c. 6 he puts into the mouth of Jesus, concerning the Bread of Life. The words about eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking His blood must be later than Jesus,² and can only have been suggested by the experience of the Church. Yet it is impossible to suppose that the author is insisting on the importance of the sacramental rite—especially in view of his omission of the institution. Rather, he takes the observance for granted, and (consistently with his main purpose in writing the

¹ *The Four Gospels*, 216.

² Could He possibly have uttered such words publicly, "in the synagogue at Capernaum", in face of the horror of His hearers at the idea of eating human flesh, and that with which all Jews regarded the drinking of any blood?

Gospel) puts the whole emphasis on its spiritual significance: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing". Not the ceremony itself, but what it means, is to his mind all-important.

II.

Having thus glanced at the evidence, we proceed to its interpretation. This is by no means easy. Paul was doubtless voicing the general view of the Christians of his time, reporting that which he "received", when he represented Jesus as establishing a ceremony for observance in His Church until His return in glory—a "proclamation", or symbolic re-enactment, of His death for men. Yet some of the foremost Protestant scholars, examining the Gospels with minds free from traditional preconceptions, judge it to be unlikely that Jesus ever definitely envisaged a society of His followers separate from the Jewish Church, or gave any thought to its organization. If He did not, He can hardly have intended to establish a ceremony. And, as was said above, it is Paul alone who reports the words "this do". The Marcan story does not *disprove* that a rite was instituted; but such an interpretation does not naturally arise, it has to be "read in". If we take that story as it stands, disregarding for the moment Paul's account, what it suggests to us is that the mind of Jesus was mainly occupied with the terrible crisis which He saw close at hand, and with its effects upon the disciples. The traitor had left the party to carry through his dreadful bargain with the priests; on that very night He Himself would probably be seized and carried off for execution. The Shepherd would be smitten and the sheep would be scattered. Unnerved with terror, His foremost disciple would deny Him. How then could the Kingdom come? How could His life-work be anything but a tragic failure? The shadows of Gethsemane were gathering fast about His spirit. How could those poor feeble souls, who had not yet been able to contemplate the possibility of their Master's death, carry on His work without Him? How could they possibly, when deprived of His leadership, bring to a triumphant harvest the Kingdom that He had only begun to implant in their hearts? Only, if He could bind them to Himself in a bond of fellowship and love so strong that even His death should not have power to break it. This farewell meal gave Him the opportunity He needed. No bond of comradeship between men in that ancient world was stronger than that of eating and drinking together; and the sacrificial system was believed to establish a similar tie of fellowship between man and his God. The language of sacrifice used by Jesus was therefore exactly appropriate: it supplied what He needed to give the act its supreme impressiveness, and at the same time to enable Him to impart to them some of His deepest thoughts concerning His death. He Himself was not

only a party to the covenant, He was the victim also, whose life would shortly be forfeit. And, as the "blood of the covenant", sprinkled on the people in the ancient ritual,¹ assured them of acceptance and communion with God, so the shedding of His own blood would be the means of winning "many" into the Kingdom. The faith of Jesus rises triumphant over His anxiety and dread. Not in spite of His death, but by means of it, the Kingdom would yet be established, and He Himself would drink its new wine at the Messianic feast.²

The natural interpretation of *Mark's* story of the Supper, therefore, would make it the supreme moment in the relation of Jesus to His immediate disciples, in which He was able so to impress them with His own spirit as to ensure that His death, far from putting an end to the hope of the Kingdom, would be the very means through which He would achieve it. In this way He was able to regard the coming Cross, though brought about by the wickedness of men, as capable of being turned, by dedication and obedience, to the fulfilment of the Divine purpose. Had men's hearts been less hard, and their eyes less blind, some other means than the sacrifice of God's own Son might have availed for human redemption. But, if this bitter cup must be drunk, He would not flinch. The last Supper, therefore, even if no rite was instituted, seems to lose nothing of its supreme appeal to all that is deepest in the human heart; and its observance in the Church has undoubtedly helped to carry that appeal down the centuries.

The fragment about the Supper preserved in the original *Luke* (22¹⁵⁻¹⁸), while almost certainly an independent narrative, does little more than expand the striking eschatological passage in *Mark* (14²⁵). It shows the faith of Jesus triumphant over death: faith that, in spite of the coming tragedy, the Kingdom is close at hand. There is in these verses none of the language of sacrifice, and nothing to suggest a memorial of His death. He seems to be trying to share with His disciples His own assurance of victory.

We see then that the Gospels, critically examined, present indications that the common view of the Church (including Paul) of the institution of the Eucharistic rite by our Lord Himself was not universally held. It is difficult to believe that the Synoptists, had they shared that view, could have omitted "this do", or that "*John*", in his story of the Supper, could have ignored it altogether. I am leaving unanswered the question how, if the words of institution were never uttered by Jesus, the belief in them arose and spread. So far as I am aware, evidence is lacking. What we gather from scanty references in *Acts* is that in its earliest form the Eucharist was a common meal or "breaking of bread" together.³ We find evidence

¹ *Ex.* 24⁸. ² *Matt.* alone (26²⁹) has "with you".

³ *Acts* 24⁶, 207, etc.

outside the New Testament that this Agape or love-feast was long continued in immediate connexion with the solemn rite, but that it was afterwards separated and finally forbidden as profane. It seems to have been Paul who started the process of separation, on the ground that the meal as practised at Corinth led to disorder. He probably heightened the mystical thoughts attached to the rite by his language about the body and blood of Christ—which certainly gives some colour to the "Catholic" interpretation.¹ The expressions of Jesus, as reported in *Mark*, do not go beyond a lofty symbolism: "This bread represents my body; this cup stands for the blood of the covenant, which is shed for many". Had it not been for Paul's words, it is questionable whether the idea of transubstantiation would ever have arisen in the Church.

There is one question that has often been asked, which should not be wholly passed over. *Did Jesus Himself* eat the bread and drink the wine with His disciples? The narratives are not explicit, and we are left to inference. Interpreters who press the idea of sacrifice are inclined to conclude that He did not; others who emphasize the side of communion suggest that He did. The "no more" (οὐκέτι) of *Mk.* 14²⁵ is most naturally taken to mean that He had just drunk—for the last time in this world. As has been noted above, the ideas of communion and of sacrifice were closely blended; and if Jesus felt Himself to be ideally the victim as well as one of the parties to the covenant, I do not think we should press the argument that He could not partake of that which represented Himself. But as to this we may be content to rest in uncertainty.

The question whether (or to what extent) the Eucharistic practice in the Church took form from the rites of the pagan Mysteries hardly arises here. Our subject is the Last Supper, and all the existing accounts of it seem to be too early for their thought or language to have been so influenced. Besides, devout Palestinian Jews lived in a little world of their own, and looked with disfavour on the attempts of some of their countrymen to live like the Gentiles around them. Paul sharply contrasts "the table of the Lord" with what he calls "the table of demons".² The influence may possibly be reflected to some extent in the language of *John* 6^{51ff}; but it can hardly have been powerful till after the first century, when Christianity was spreading rapidly throughout the Roman world. Primitive thoughts about the Supper, and about the communion it symbolized, seem to find their explanation (so far as this can be found) in Jewish religion.

I trust that this study, however imperfect, is on sound historical lines, and that there has been no attempt to twist the facts to suit a particular theory or practice. If so, it would seem that we must at

¹ *1 Cor.* 10¹⁶, 11²⁷, etc.

² *1 Cor.* 10²¹.

least leave open the question whether the Eucharistic ceremony can be traced to the mind of Jesus Himself, or whether the Church's authority is all we can claim for it. The practical outcome would seem to be that its observance must in future be based on grounds of expediency, rather than of obedience to a command of our Lord. So far as it is found to minister to the deepest needs of the Christian life, to bind the followers of Jesus in deathless bonds to Himself, to make the Cross a living experience, and to energize their lives by His indwelling Spirit, it will continue to be observed in His universal Church. But in that Church, as its separated branches come into closer union, a place must be found for those who believe they reach the reality without the symbol. Even by the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne in 1927, it was recognized that there are those "who, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit".

EDWARD GRUBB.

HOW TO CONSIDER A CALL.

R. W. DALE AS EXEMPLAR.

IN 1871, when the Clapton Park Congregational Church was moving from the Old Gravel Pit Chapel to the spacious "Round Chapel" where it now worships, its minister, Dr. James Spence, was compelled to resign the pastorate, his heart not being equal to the strain of preaching in the new building. In accordance with the church's custom the deacons called together the heads of families, who voted, 37 for and 5 against, a resolution, subsequently carried by 114 to 14 at a church meeting and 158 to 6 at the statutory meeting, calling R. W. Dale to the pastorate.

The ensuing correspondence is characteristic of Dale, and may be welcome in this his centenary year: it has not been printed previously. In its seriousness and in its tactfulness it is indeed a model for ministers. The church's letter of invitation, signed by eight deacons, may serve as an introduction to Dale's letters, which are addressed, the first four to James Carter, the fifth to the church, and the last two to Henry Child. Mr. Carter and Mr. Child were deacons, and both were grandfathers of the Rev. Henry Child Carter, of Cambridge. The first letter is written from 55 Bristol Road, Birmingham, the rest from Field Side, Grasmere.

For the Birmingham and Carrs Lane attitude to the invitation, see A. W. W. Dale's *R. W. Dale*, pp. 299, ff.

The Church's Letter of Invitation (21st July, 1871).

Though no formal communication has yet been made to you, yet we are conscious such rumours must have reached you as will prevent this letter taking you by surprise.

Since the final retirement of our late respected pastor, Dr. Spence, on 24th June last, we have taken pains to learn the sentiments and wishes of our church as to the choice of a successor, and the preliminary steps the deacons have taken have led to the adoption of a resolution passed at a special Church Meeting last evening to the following purport:

"That the Church hereby choose the Rev. R. W. Dale, M.A., of Birmingham, as its pastor, and request the deacons to invite him accordingly."

We therefore, dear sir, would urge this resolution on your consideration, and fervently desire, with submission to Him Who rules all hearts, that you may decide to accept it.

The migration of our flock from the narrow fold at the Old Gravel Pit to the broader one of Clapton Park Chapel has much enlarged the sphere of action in which as a church we deem it our duty to move. Among our families numbers of young people are growing up who are the hopes of the succeeding age. For them we seek a pastor whose wise and affectionate private counsels, added to the instructions of the pulpit, may guide them in the paths of Scriptural piety. While for the populous and increasing neighbourhood around us we desire a tender, though powerful

and manly, exhibition of Gospel truth to win their hearts to Christ. Now, dear Sir, for this purpose we turn our thoughts to you, and in the name, and by the almost unanimous voice of our church, we hereby invite you to become our pastor.

We joyfully acknowledge and would give thanks to God for the success which has attended your course and labours in Birmingham, and if we feared that your acceptance of the pastorship would narrow your opportunities of usefulness as a Christian minister it would not become us to urge it. But we think you would find it otherwise, and that the scope for active and vigorous pastoral labour would yield you full employment and heart-felt pleasure. May we therefore request a confidential interview with yourself, either by a deputation waiting on you when and where you may appoint, or by your visiting the house of one of our brethren where all could meet you?

At such time every circumstance important shall be faithfully laid before you to guide your decision.

Praying for the divine guidance of you and us.

DALE'S LETTERS.

I (July 22, 71—Saturday night).

Your letter reached me this afternoon.

My brain is weary with the strain of nearly eleven months of almost unintermitted work. I have to preach twice to-morrow, and have the additional anxiety of having to communicate to my deacons the fact that an invitation has reached me from Clapton. On Monday I have to give the charge at a Missionary ordination.

I feel that I must have a day or two's quiet before even looking at this grave question, and therefore, I shall not disturb the arrangements which I had made before I received your communication, to go to Grasmere on Tuesday.

There are several things which I should like to know even before settling an interview, but of these I will write from Grasmere.

It is a singular coincidence that it is just nine years ago since I had any very serious thought of leaving Birmingham, and then a proposal which was laid before me to go out to Melbourne and which very strongly attracted me, reached me just as I was starting for Rydal, and I thought it all over among the same hills which will, I hope, be round about me on Tuesday night.

Give my very kind regards to your brethren in office.

II (July 26, 1871—Wednesday).

In the hasty note which I wrote to you on Saturday evening I said that there were one or two points on which I should be glad to have information before arranging for an interview.

Will you be good enough to let me know (1) the number of persons in Church-membership and having votes at the Church meeting; (2) the number that voted for the Resolution which you have forwarded me; (3) the number that were neutral and that voted against it.

If there are any facts, which you can communicate by letter and which you think I ought to know, I shall be glad to receive them. I feel at present too weary to make the effort necessary to look the question fairly in the face; but in a day or two I shall doubtless be all right.

III (July 30, 71).

I am very much obliged to you for the explicit information contained in your letter.

It is clear that the number of votes given for the invitation does not reach one half of the number of members in fellowship,¹ and though large deductions are properly made for the aged, the sick, and persons absent from home, I cannot very well resist the impression that, if there is no strength of hostility to the invitation, there is no general eagerness in its support.

This impression is so strong as to constitute an almost adequate reason for declining the further consideration of the question; for even if a unanimous and earnest invitation had reached me, I should have been compelled to think long and earnestly before surrendering the position of usefulness and comfort which I have at Carrs Lane.

It is due, however, to the church at Clapton that I should fairly consider what can be urged in consideration² on the other side.

I will, therefore, arrange to meet a deputation from the diaconate somewhere between here and London, unless indeed the deputation think that a day among these pleasant hills would compensate them for the long journey.

The most convenient point of meeting between here and London would be at Crewe. A train leaves Dalston at 8.30 in the morning and reaches Crewe at 1.5 :—a train leaves Crewe at 5.20 and professes to reach Dalston at 9.35. I could leave here at 8 and be at Crewe at 1.12—and a train at 4.10 would bring me back here the same night. As I am here holiday-making, one day would be as convenient to me as another, except that if the Crewe arrangement is preferred, I should be glad to have it on any other day than next Thursday, when I am expecting two of my children to arrive.

Our post does not come in till too late for me to catch the early train from Windermere, so that I should be glad to have two days' notice.

I shall be very thankful to see clear light on this matter:—my conviction is that light comes when the hour for decision arrives.

IV (Aug. 4, 71).

It is very kind of the brethren to undertake so long a journey to meet me.

I think that it will be best for me to come over to Windermere on Tuesday morning; I can get there sooner than you can get here, and our lodgings here are so small that I could hardly receive the deputation as I should like to receive them.

I take it for granted that they will stay at *Rigg's*—the Railway Hotel, and I will be with them soon after nine o'clock.

It would be well that the deputation should write or telegraph to Mr. Rigg saying what number of beds they will require on Monday night:—the Hotel is sometimes very full. My Carrs Lane friends will be coming up a day or two after, and I earnestly hope that I may be able to arrive at a decision before the end of the week.

¹ 470 at the end of 1870.

² Word difficult to read.

V (August 10th, 1871).

My dear Friends,

After prolonged and anxious consideration of the resolution adopted at your church meeting on July 20th last inviting me to become your pastor, I have concluded that it is my duty to remain in Birmingham. The honourable traditions of your church, its unbroken peace through a history of nearly 70 years, its evangelistic activity, the intelligence and devoutness which I believe distinguish its members, and the great opportunity afforded by your new chapel for the preaching of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, constitute inducements to accept the pastorate which few ministers would find it easy to resist. To myself, the pastorate of Clapton Park had a special and still stronger attraction. For years I have been longing to be released, if it were God's will, from the strain of public work of many kinds in which I feel bound to engage as long as I remain in my present position—work in which I have the deepest interest and which I believe to be intimately associated with the triumphs of the Kingdom of Christ, but which necessarily absorbs much of the time and strength which a minister would prefer to devote to solitary thought and to the service of the church.

Your invitation seemed to me to offer an opportunity of living a life of less excitement and of greater quietness than is possible to me in Birmingham, but after great hesitation, I have arrived at the conclusion that I ought to decline it.

I thank you, from my very heart, for the great honour you have done me in offering to place in my hands so grave a trust and shall earnestly pray that you may very soon secure a minister more worthy of your confidence than myself, with a deeper knowledge of the Will of God and a larger measure of the Spirit of Christ. It would not be right for me to close this letter without expressing my affection and cordial gratitude for the singular kindness and consideration which have been shown to me by your deacons. If it is not presumptuous for me to speak of men, several of whom were in Christ before I was born, I trust that they will allow me to say that my brief intercourse with them has given me a strong conviction that their practical sagacity, their generous spirit and their Christian earnestness will greatly lighten the anxieties and labours of your future pastor.

I am, my dear friends,

Yours very faithfully,

R. W. DALE.

VI (Aug. 11, 71).

My reply to the Clapton Park invitation will be sent to Mr. Carter by this evening's Post.

Into the reasons which have at last brought me to the conclusion that I ought to remain where I am I cannot enter at length. The pressure which has been brought to bear upon me is such that hardly any man could resist. My own people, with an enthusiasm of unanimity implore me to remain with them;—the Church and Congregation—the Ladies—the Sunday School Teachers—all appeal to me separately, and I have been inundated with private letters, filled with affection and grief. The Pastors and Deacons of the Independent and Baptist Churches have held a special meeting to urge me to stay. Two of the Independent Churches have done

the same. Organizations of working men altogether unconnected with any religious community and with which I have had no special relations have sent me resolutions to the same effect. An Address has also been sent to me signed by a large number of the Magistrates, members of the Corporation, and other leaders of the Liberal Party in Birmingham—including professional men; the recognized representatives of the working classes—and even two clergymen, who although they say they are not “Liberals” wish to unite in the address. What has affected me most deeply is that I have received assurance after assurance of the spiritual benefit which has been received through God’s blessing on my Ministry, about the success of which I have sometimes very gloomy and desponding thoughts.

I earnestly hope that the negotiations will do nothing to interfere with the early and harmonious election of a Pastor at Clapton Park—whose ministry shall prove that in reference to the Pastorate as in reference to so many other things, “second thoughts are best”.

Accept my very cordial thanks for your own kindness to me and ever believe me to remain [&c.].

VII (Aug. 21, 71).

I know not how to thank you either for the Resolution¹ which you have been good enough to forward to me or for the letter which accompanies it; both are most kind and generous. My great anxiety now is that the time which has been consumed in negotiating with me may prove not to have been lost. I shall never cease to be grateful for the manner in which the Clapton Park Church has treated me, and shall have the greatest possible pleasure in rendering it any slight service that may be in my power.

ALBERT PEEL.

¹ The resolution, passed at a Church Meeting, on 17th August, reads:

“That this meeting has heard with deep regret the intimation that the Revd. R. W. Dale, M.A., cannot yield to the invitation of this Church to become its pastor; the acceptance of which they had looked forward to with large expectations of happy and prolonged usefulness. This meeting cannot, however, suffer the present opportunity to pass without giving expression to their high appreciation of the honourable and sacred principles which have governed Mr. Dale in his decision on this important occasion; and, while they have reason to mourn over their disappointment, they are pleased to know that the result will gladden the hearts of many in Birmingham. They moreover cherish the full belief that it has been wrought out by the interposition of the Divine Head of the Church who has thus made known His will that His servant should remain in the place where he commenced his ministry as a Pastor, and where the evidence of his efficiency and success is so abundant. May he continue to advance, and may the work of the Lord still prosper in his hand!”

THE HAND.

Who dreamed the hand, by which the first men wrought
Rough flints to some crude semblance of their thought
—With god-like perseverance strove to train
To do the bidding of their bestial brain—
Held in its little span the power that brings
The seen from unseen, turning thoughts to things?
Who would have dreamed the body's untried tool
A million million instruments should rule—
Loose with a turn the dreadful might of speed,
And bring to rest a giant so lightly freed?
What hunting man, who in his cavern drew
With childish joy the lines of beasts he knew,
Looking upon his squatting mate, could tell
That man should make all womanhood to dwell—
Beauty of soul and unimagined grace—
In lines and colours of a pictured face?
When Music, that angelic Bird, was caught,
Trapped by old wandering men, could She have thought,
As clumsy fingers touched the first rude lyre,
That hands could learn to speak the heart's desire?
The Egyptian who first scratched his marks on clay
Dreamed not that he was marking out the way
By which Keats' hand could glean his teeming brain,
Or Newton's make the mysteries of Nature plain.
What marvels have been wrought by hands of men,
With aid of wheel and lyre, and brush and pen!
But no less strange the power by which the hand
Speaks soul to soul, and makes us understand
All that the tongue can never turn to speech—
The longings for a love beyond our reach;
Or joy in love fulfilled, and mutual pride;
And all the steady faith of friendship tried,
Built on the rock of manhood's reticence;
Sweet candour of a child's swift confidence—
The clasp of fingers is the subtle token
By which these secrets of the soul are spoken.
Who knows what further power the hand doth hold?
What loftier purpose yet it may unfold?
We know its power to make; to translate feeling;
But scarce imagine yet its gift of healing.
In fugitive tales that future truth is stored
Which once upon a heedless world was poured:
Those Hands commanding, pleading, tortured, nailed,
As men count failure, in Their purpose failed:
Though by Their Touch the blind and lame were healed,
The fullness of that Power was not revealed:
Yet still the pledge remains: It hath sufficed
That men have felt upon their hearts the Hands of Christ.

MARJORIE NOEL HOW.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organisation, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

PRACTICE AND THEORY, AND THE MINISTER.

MATHEMATICS is in its nature pure theory, and it is appropriate that the mathematician should go on reading and thinking and writing and speaking about it. But religion is not entirely an abstract science; it cannot exist unless it is applied. One can go only a certain way with the theory of it, and then the theory itself becomes radically false unless it is put into practice.

The normal ways of practising religion and making something more than a name of holiness are through *work* and *play* and the *home*. But in this sense the minister has no work. He must exercise his legs and his brain, of course, but he has no clearly-defined function to perform, of which he is the servant as other people are the servants of that which justifies their place in society. He cannot forget himself in his work; on the contrary, all he does makes him more conscious of himself. If he were to do what men expect of him, in the attitude of one performing allotted tasks, he would fail altogether to achieve his object. Men would say he had lost the "human touch". He must be free to act as the circumstances of the moment prescribe; there must be nothing prescribed beforehand.

When a man who is under authority is told, "Do this," he does not need to reason with himself about the wisdom of doing it; he does what he is told, and loses himself in the doing of it. He tries to do it better than he ever did it before. This gives his self-conscious mind—his conscience—a rest, and promotes moral health. The minister, on the other hand, exclaims with Wordsworth,

Me this unchartered freedom tires :
I feel the weight of chance desires.

A second differentiation is *play*. The minister has either no play or very little, for the simple reason that he has nobody to play with. Other people form tennis clubs and all kinds of social clubs, and the members have this in common, that they are all drawn from the same

social class and have the same outlook on life. There are some clubs where ministers may meet, but this is exceptional. And if the minister might overcome the difficulty inherent in outlook, yet this obstacle remains and prevents him from forgetting himself in play—namely, the fact that his leisure time is the time when other people are most engaged in work, and their leisure time is in the evenings, when he is most a minister. He does not even observe the “day of rest”.

Finally, he is differentiated from other people by the home. Very many ministers are not married, and have no home. For the rest, the minister's house is an appendage of the church, and all that happens in it has a peculiar significance for other people than its inmates. “The fierce light that beats upon the throne” is dim in comparison with the light that beats upon a minister's so-called “private” life. He has no private life in the sense in which other people have it. He cannot say, “Here at least I may forget the spectators and be myself.”

We conclude that he can never be normal, because he is deprived of work, play, and home. Nobody can realize himself unless he forgets himself, and this the minister is not allowed to do. Nobody is quite alive unless he sometimes gives up working out theories of conduct and allows his theories to work themselves out. This is the relation of Practice to Theory, and this relation is broken in the life of a minister.

Two consequences follow, which are often observed but seldom attributed to their proper cause. First, there is that which is deplored by one of the people who conduct the symposium called *The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table*, namely, the frequent dullness of preaching. How should preachers ever be dull, with such a message to proclaim? The answer is that the sublimest truths become dull when they are regarded with a purely abstract interest. One can imagine, for example, that considerable animation might attend the discussion of a question of town-planning. But as soon as the question becomes an abstract one it is not easy to be animated any longer. No heart was ever uplifted, no eyes shed tears, over the propounding of the truth that two sides of a triangle are greater than the third side.

Secondly, here is an explanation of the tendency of ministers to become formal and ritualistic, and to promote the institutional part of religion. They hanker after forms because their lives lack forms. Other people, who are weary of the excessive routine of their lives, long for something purely spontaneous or “spiritual” in their religious exercises. But the minister, weary of the abstract spirituality that fills his life, longs for definite prescribed forms. He desires also to make the Church a definite institution, with the laws and duly-allotted functions of an institution, so that he may conceive himself

as having a vocation in the world—something outside himself, precise and concrete, to which to relate himself. Therefore he may even become a Roman Catholic priest, although he has been accustomed to advise all other men to keep away from the dishonesty and tyranny that the Roman Catholic Church embodies. The true cause why Protestant clergymen become priests is not, as we are so often told, that they “must have something to believe”, but that they must have something to *do*.

There is another side to this whole question of the relation of Practice and Theory. The impatience of the modern world with all religious observances is not to be laid at the door of the representatives of the Church alone. *They* are too much pre-occupied with theory. Most people, on the other hand, are too much pre-occupied with practice. One recalls G. K. Chesterton's deprecating of the usual description of the “practical sweep”. What we need, he says, is more theoretical sweeps, and more theoretical people of every sort. Without doubt he is right. One might amplify the theme with special regard to the class of people in society who regard themselves as the mainstay of the Church, the respectable middle class. They do not want to be disturbed with any theory of life which conflicts with the theory that their inherited standards are final, for on this they base their practice. That theory has actually broken down, but the whole order of society may come tumbling about their ears before they will acknowledge any defect.

But our present purpose is to consider one side of the matter only—the minister's side. It remains to make some suggestions about the overcoming of the separation of Practice and Theory which is a fact of his experience.

The Jews had a rule—to which they may still adhere—that their Rabbis, their religious teachers, should support themselves by working at a trade. In line with this, the Apostle Paul was a weaver or a tanner. It was a good rule, and a return to it by modern clergymen would be an unqualified blessing.

The religious brotherhoods of history also have something to teach us. It cannot be good to have a minister set in isolation over a congregation, having little association with any other minister. In every city and town at least there could be a college of teachers and pastors, either living together, or with a good deal of association. So they would know something of normal human relations, in which the theory they discuss might be put into practice.

But the heart of the question is in the conception we have of the function of the Church and of the Ministry in the Church. For there are two alternatives, generally confused, but really sharply opposed. These are the conception of the Church as Priest and the conception of the Church as Prophet. People have been conscious of the sharp opposition between these conceptions in generations that

are past, and a great deal of Church History relates to the opposition. It cannot be maintained that to-day the opposition has been overcome. It has been confused and has become unconscious in our minds, and that is the only difference.

For the fulfilling of the priestly function it is necessary that the Church should be a highly organized system and that responsibilities within it should be clearly defined. The responsibility attaching to the minister may then be that of teacher. If so, the same respect is due to his authority as to the authority of any other teacher. He is not to be accorded merely whatever respect his personality may command, but he has a right to a certain place in men's esteem by virtue of his office, for which he is assumed to have qualified. In performing the duties of that office he puts his theory into practice. He becomes like other people in having a specific function as a teacher of his subject. Or he may be regarded as an administrator and ruler. Then people do what he tells them, not because they like him, nor because they think he is right, nor because he has an overbearing manner, but simply because he holds a certain office, comparable with the office of a civil magistrate, and is invested with similar authority and similar responsibility. In filling that perfectly definite office the minister follows his vocation; he is conscious of definite demands made upon him; his theory of life is real because he embodies it in practice.

This priestly function of the minister depends on the priestly function of the Church. But if one cannot conceive the Church to have any authority over its members, if one considers that the only forms of human association that ought to be recognized are political and economic, then it must follow that one cannot conceive the minister to have a priestly vocation.

What then remains? The alternative that remains is a conception of both Church and Ministry as prophetic in their function. This is stated in the elementary truth that God "by divers portions and in divers manners" from time to time entrusts some men with a message to their fellows. Never a great wrong is perpetrated but somebody rises up to denounce it. Every generation has its prophets. They are poets, statesmen, novelists, playwrights—men of every class and calling, who have keener spiritual sensibility than other people, men of vision who tell what they have seen. Sometimes it may happen that they are preachers in the Church. But not all preachers exercise the prophetic function—though many think they do who only deliver at second hand what the veritable prophet has written or said. For if it is to have a place in the Church it cannot be through any recognized office. Inspiration cannot be reduced to a system. A government cannot run its own revolutions.

The reluctant conclusion is that if the priestly function is to be ruled out it is not necessary to maintain any Church order at all.

What the exercise of the prophetic function does demand is that there should be liberty of opinion and of speech. In every place individuals would then be found forming groups of disciples around them; people would turn aside from their work to discuss the meaning of their work in the light of eternity, and would be led in their thinking and in their worship by such men as proved themselves to have natural insight and eloquence. In this scheme there is no room for any of the professional ministries at present exemplifying every possible degree of compromise and confusion of thought, and stultifying themselves by their inevitable separation of Practice and Theory.

Underlying all questions of reunion is this distinction, which cannot be ignored but must be made clear if there is to be any reality in the proposals. The prophetic community must no longer envy the name of Church, and the prophet must no longer desire the office, while repudiating the name, of priest. A definition of functions alone will make it possible to reconcile once more Practice with Theory.

W. S. FERRIE.

A FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER.

It began—if it is possible to trace the beginning of these things at all—on a Wednesday night. There were fewer than ever at the week-night service. I should be ashamed to tell how few there were. And yet perhaps I ought to tell, because is it not God's way to make big things out of small ones, and bring strength out of weakness? To be exact, then, there were eight of us, and a pretty depressing business it was. I put aside the notes of my address. I just offered an opening prayer and then asked if anyone could tell me the reason for such a small meeting.

Then followed a discussion in which I was more a listener than a speaker. I heard the spiritual condition of the church being discussed in a way I had never heard before. It was not conducted in any spirit of righteous condemnation of those who were absent. On the contrary, it was all remarkable for its humility. They spoke about "we" all the time, and every criticism of the church went right home to "us". Of course, the burden of it all was the appalling poverty of our prayer-life. Before I realized it an hour had slipped by, so we sung a hymn, asked God's blessing, and then went home. We had come to no conclusions. We had made no decisions. Altogether I felt a little confused about what had taken place.

Three or four weeks went by and then came one of those awful Sundays which are enough to break a minister's heart. It was evening and the rain was pelting down. As I sat in my study preparing for the service I was certain there would be "no one there".

When I opened the vestry door into the church and went into the pulpit I saw that my fears had been justified. The congregation was quite the smallest I have ever seen—fifty people in a building which holds a thousand, and of course scattered all over the place, including the gallery. It was impossible to preach a sermon. So when the time came I laid aside the sermon, left the pulpit, and came down to the very front of the church. I told the people of our recent week-night service experience. I retailed much of what had been said, and then I found myself giving a pledge to face up to the situation and evolve something that would nourish the spiritual life of the church more effectively. Once again I went home with not the slightest idea of what to do, and also with the encouragement of one member who told me that he "didn't see why they should have been done out of a sermon—the few who were there being made to suffer for those who were absent".

Time went on and I felt I could do nothing more than let the thing germinate in my mind for a while. And then one day I asked myself if it were right to proceed on the assumption that my people were not praying. Perhaps there was prayer in many unexpected places, very timid and reluctant to make itself known. If that were so—and why should I not assume it?—ought not I as a minister to enlist that prayer for the life and work of the church? Was there no way in which I could get to know about it and, without intrusion, claim the privilege of directing it in some respects?

So I settled down to sketch out the different methods of prayer known to me which might be expected to have a place in the lives of some of my people. There were surely those who still kept to the morning and evening prayer. Indeed I knew there were, when I came to think of it. They would be certain to give their help. Then there were those whose prayer more frequently took the form of a thought, unformed and inarticulate, sent out on the wings of desire into the unseen. This, I felt sure, was a way of prayer that would be recognized by many, young and old.

Next I thought of those who would never be willing to make known what was their manner of praying. Would they consent, I wondered, at least to acknowledge that they did pray, and would they be willing to group themselves according to their most lively interest in the church, as workers? Then there was that company of people who by their circumstances were unable to join in the fellowship of worship—the sick, mothers with little children, and others who for good reasons are kept from church. And, again, there were those who would never willingly surrender the opportunities of meeting together for prayer, either in silence or as guided by inspiration.

So I drew up the outline of a Fellowship of Prayer which should include all these. The letter and the outline is printed below exactly as drawn up and sent to all members and worshippers. I had no

idea at all what response might come, but I was determined not to force it. I had decided that if twenty joined it would be worth while. It would mean that I should send them a pastoral letter at intervals calling them to pray for certain objects, and I should know with certainty then that the affairs of the church were being laid before God in many ways, at many times, and by a number of people. After I had sent out the invitation someone told me I ought to preach about it. I was a little reluctant to do this because I wanted the response to be spontaneous and quite unforced. However, I consented to speak about it one Sunday night.

Strangely enough that night was again one of those disastrous Sunday evenings which try a minister's patience. I had the merest handful of people. But I comforted myself with the thought that they were the ones who most wanted to come, so I went through with it.

And now the result. To my amazement I had over a hundred replies. I hardly knew what to do. This was so much more than I had expected. Moreover I began to think of the work involved in sending out a hundred letters every month. How could it be done? A friend offered me the use of his duplicator. Another friend offered to address envelopes. A third offered to deliver them. A fourth thought it was going to be rather expensive, so would I accept a gift? All these offers came unasked for, and they have been most gladly accepted.

Our Fellowship of Prayer is now in regular order, and I could quote incidents and experiences which are the undoubted outcome of the prayers that have been offered. It has given me the opportunity of writing pastoral letters of a kind that one would not readily print in a magazine. I feel that I have more than a hundred people in my confidence. I have only to mention a thing and it becomes a prayer. The results are incalculable. The streams of prayer that before were allowed to trickle their way across the life of the church are now directed into a deep and life-giving river which flows through every department of activity.

But that is not all. The stream has gone far out beyond this church. I have never sought publicity for the Fellowship, but it has been claimed. I have spoken about it, because I was asked, to the ministers of my Province, and I believe that many of them have adapted it to their needs. I have been called upon to speak about it to ministers of other denominations. And now I am asked to write about it in our *Quarterly*. It has already gone across the sea, for one of our members has gone to China, and before leaving joined the Fellowship of Workers.

I have proved to my own satisfaction that it was a cruel libel on my church ever to have supposed that prayer was failing. It had not failed. Rather, it lacked direction. The old prayer meeting is

not enough for to-day. It helps and satisfies very many. But there are many more for whom it means nothing. This does not mean that they do not pray. Nor does it mean that they are unwilling to join in the fellowship of prayer. But prayer to-day is very shy, and perhaps all the more real for that. At any rate I have discovered a new reality in the church which I had not recognized before, and I can give thanks now for that deplorable Wednesday evening which was the beginning—if it is possible to trace the beginning of these things at all.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF PRAYER.

*" More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?"*

I invite all my people to group themselves for prayer in one or more of these Fellowships, which together will give support to all sectional prayer-meetings, and extend beyond the circle which meets on Wednesday nights. The purpose of each is to secure that the great affairs of our Church shall constantly be carried upon the hearts of our people before God. We ought at all times to pray for one another and for the business of His Kingdom as it is being carried out by this Church.

At intervals I propose to send a letter to the members of each Fellowship, containing suggestions appropriate to the particular group. Members will also be furnished with a list of those who belong to their group.

In these five Fellowships there is sufficient diversity of method and outlook to draw together the greatest number into the one common purpose which Jesus Christ has named: " Men ought always to pray."

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE SECRET WATCH.

There are some for whom a morning or an evening prayer is the most effective devotional approach to God. In these few moments before the day begins, or at its close, our affairs are brought to God, our friends are remembered, our life is adjusted to the example of our Master and in quietness and confidence we find our strength. There are new prayers to be offered and new friends to be helped by such a fellowship as this.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF SILENT THOUGHT.

There are some whose way of prayer is to pause in thought for a moment in the very midst of the day's work, allowing some petition, thanksgiving, confession, or some other prayer-thought to hold the field of consciousness. Without striving, without words, but in spirit and in truth we wait upon God, and He who reads the heart can hear the prayer. This is sometimes the way in which young people are best able to learn the meaning and the value of prayer. There are certain prayer-thoughts waiting to be shared by such a fellowship.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF WORKERS.

There are some who work in spiritual isolation, knowing little of their brothers' needs. But a strange new power comes to all who know that

every day the work they do is being held in remembrance before God by their fellow-workers in other spheres. All who come under the name of Church Worker, and others who hold them in special sympathy, may join this Fellowship for the mutual support it will give, each commending the work of the other to God in whatever manner they are accustomed to pray.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF HOME WORSHIPPERS.

There are some who cannot join with us in public worship or in the active life of our Church. These are the 'sick, the disabled, the aged, the mothers of little children, and those who nurse or serve at home. And there are others who by their visits and their prayers are constantly carrying to such homes the spirit of love which is moving in our company. All these may band together to take their share in the Church's life.

THE FELLOWSHIP OF THE UPPER ROOM.

There are some who greatly love the meeting together for prayer, remembering those experiences of the Upper Room from which first sprang all the strength and vitality of the Christian Church. For such we may form a Fellowship to meet in the Church between 8 and 8.30 p.m. on the Saturday before the first Sunday of the month. During that time the Church shall become a place where members of the Fellowship may resort for prayer. They shall come and go as they please, and for a few minutes only the Minister will guide the thoughts and prayers, and a little time shall be set apart for those who are willing to pray aloud.

This Fellowship is especially recommended to business people, who might well turn in here on their way home. It will make a fitting conclusion to the month, and a helpful preparation for the next.

[Here followed an application form for those desiring to join any section of the Fellowship.]

N. A. TURNER-SMITH.

CHRIST'S WORK FOR THE CHILDREN.

A SUNDAY School opening new buildings and looking for some suitable ceremony with which to celebrate that opening may find this record of the opening of the Sunday Schools of Trinity Church, St. Albans, of service.

After puzzling our heads and pooling our experience we decided to hold a three days' Exhibition which should illustrate "Christ's Work for the Children—in Our Own and Other Lands through all the Centuries and To-day." The Exhibition divided itself naturally into two main Sections: I. The Work done in our own land; II. The Work done in other lands.

Section I was organized by our "Social Service Committee." The exhibits were arranged on different stalls covering almost every aspect of child life—Health, Work, Play, Welfare, Sunday School, The Ill-used Child, The Poor Child, The Child Offender. It included all sorts of things, from an old "battledore spelling card" to furniture actually made in the exhibition by the boys of the Herts (Reformatory) Training School.

One of the very happy features of the Exhibition was the introduction to so many Societies and people who are working for the children in one way or another. Societies like the Shaftesbury Society, the Save the Children Fund, the N.S.P.C.C., the League of Nations Union, as well as the Sunday School Union, were most eager to co-operate by lending interesting exhibits and sending speakers.

Section II was organized by our "Foreign Missionary Committee." The L.M.S. Headquarters provided exhibits illustrating the difference Christ has made to child life in India, China, Africa and the Islands of the Seas. "Fifteen-minute Talks" were given by experts at one or other of the stalls. The range of subjects covered by these talks may be inferred by the titles of those given on the last day: "Education"; "Children of Central Africa"; "The Poor Child of 60 Years Ago and To-day"; "Child Welfare Work in St. Albans"; "Children of Central China"; "Scouts and Scouting"; "Pictures for the Children"; "Family Allowances"; "Village Education in India."

The general idea of the Exhibition was further illustrated and brought home by a series of tableaux given each evening. These were arranged and produced by the Sunday School. First there were tableaux illustrating well-known stories of children in the *O.T.*—Moses, Joseph, Samuel, David, and others. Then a series of lantern slides depicted the life of Jesus as a child, and His subsequent contact with children as recorded in the Gospels. Tableaux followed representing important developments in the work of Christ and His Church for children—from Lois instructing little Timothy, to the founding of the first Sunday School by Robert Raikes; and then a play showed what has been done and is being done for the children of the non-Christian world. Last of all came a tableau in which all who had taken part were massed together while they and the whole audience sang "Jesus shall reign."

We were considerably helped by "The Challenge Books and Pictures, Ltd.," of 24 Great Russell Street, who, in return for the privilege of selling their publications (and this was the only selling in the Exhibition except the refreshments looked after by the Women's Meeting) decorated our walls and stalls with most beautiful posters that would appeal to children.

The preparation for the Exhibition and the Exhibition itself constituted a most delightful experience and were of real value to those of us engaged in it, to the Church as a whole, and to those of the outside public who came in. Our Superintendent (Mr. S. Newell, 18 Church Crescent, St. Albans) will gladly send a programme of the Exhibition and any other information to anyone who writes to him enclosing a stamped envelope for reply. We did well, but our work is incomplete unless someone else begins where we left off and does very much better.

W. MORTON BARWELL.

CHILDREN AND THE OFFERTORY.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for the Christian Church to pay its way. The smaller congregations, the spasmodic attendance, and the increased cost of upkeep through the decreased value of money are placing large numbers of churches in a very difficult position. Besides, in this generation there is a smaller percentage of our people who recognize and discharge their responsibilities. The children grow up in the Church, and although within a few years of leaving school they are earning a good salary, they do not contribute to the Church with any sense of responsibility.

Some time ago a ministerial friend of mine told me of a young lady in his congregation who, although earning over £4 a week, regularly placed a copper in the offertory even on special occasions. She is not expected to support the home, for her father is in a good financial position. He is, and always has been, a generous supporter of the church, generally making his gifts for the wife and family.

This practice is very general. The result is that the responsibility of supporting the Church is never felt by the children. The matter of responsibility is a small thing so long as the child is still a child, but children grow up—and they are allowed to grow up—without being brought face to face with the principle of self-sacrifice. So long as they remain at home, or so long as father lives, "Father pays," and we allow the father to give for the family instead of training members of the family to give for themselves.

The Freewill Offering Scheme is doing something to break down this practice, but it is meeting with much opposition and makes but slow headway in our churches, especially when an effort is made to include the children within its scope.

The usual practice in our homes is that when the child is going to a service in which there is to be an offertory, the child goes to the parents for the "collection". Of course the contribution is readily forthcoming, but the method is wrong.

Most of us have been astonished, within recent years, at the amount of money which children seem to have to spend, as compared with our own childhood. Parents seem to be more indulgent with their children and they have more money to spend on them. The child should be taught in the home to set aside a portion of this money, however small, so that his offering may be an offering in very deed. It should become a matter of honour in the Sunday Schools that only such gifts be received. We do not want money from the parents *via* the child. We want gifts which come out of the child's life, and offerings which are prompted by his own spirit of self-sacrifice.

We invite the children to our services that they may become accustomed to the atmosphere of Christian worship, and we send them

to the Sunday School to learn the facts of the Christian Faith and Gospel. Why should we not aim at developing that central and distinctive thing—the spirit of self-sacrifice? The child should be taught early that the religion of Jesus costs something, and I have sufficient belief in human nature as God made it that the child will respond and grow up with this sacred charge making first claim upon its life and its resources.

If you wish to discover how much of the child is in the usual child's gift, make a test in your own school. Ask the children how many of them had money of their very own the previous week, and what became of it. Then ask the children where the money for the day's offertory came from. The questions will seem funny to the children; the answers will seem tragic to you.

Children are easily led to sacrifice. They become intensely interested in the things for which they have sacrificed, and great results can be secured by right direction in the early years.

Pocket money for older children should allow for church contributions. Children should be instructed in the art of conserving and dividing their allowance. Gifts for the church should be set aside first, not under compulsion but by choice and training.

Let it be clearly understood that we do not want more money from the children. We want a gift that is their very own, a part of themselves which is placed upon the altar and dedicated there. To miss a child when the offertory is taken is to snub the child. Let us admit the children to the sacred act of the offertory on the same terms as ourselves. It will become a part of their life.

The weakness of our church finance lies in the fact that it is not until late in life that we are made to realize the need of regular financial support of the Church. Our parents stood between us and the needs of the Church. We were allowed to spend our own money on ourselves until our own needs became established as the first consideration of our life.

People have so little to spare for the church to-day because they spend so much on themselves. The church is driven to all kinds of expedients in sheer desperation to exist. It is becoming increasingly difficult not only to maintain our own church, but our appeals for the larger Church outside our own fall upon deaf ears.

The Church stands for the spirit of self-sacrifice in life and the declaration of this fact and the practice of it is the only reason for our existence. We should state it without apology and without hypocrisy. Until we impress this principle upon the young lives committed to our charge, and provide them with opportunities to practise it, we shall continue to be embarrassed with financial difficulties and all our appeals for support will seem an impertinence.

W. H. STUBBS.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

PEPYS AND THE PREACHERS.

"AND so to bed", would probably now be recognized by most English-speaking people as a characteristic phrase from the diary of one, Samuel Pepys, who recorded some things of so personal a nature that they seem humorous to us in this more enlightened and more prudent age.

But the truth is that Samuel Pepys did much more than lie in his bed. Indeed, the phrase: "Up very betimes" is quite as characteristic of him as the other, if less picturesque; and his "betimes" generally means before 5 a.m. There is far more in the diary about periwigs and velvet cloaks than about nightcaps. In the nine years during which we have such an intimate record of his life their wearer was a high official of the "king's navec"—and extremely active in the performance of his duties.

The state of religion and the Church in his time was a tense and rapidly changing one.

The diary opens at the beginning of the Restoration period, with Charles II still at Breda, in Holland, but with the hopes of the Royalists fixed upon bringing him to these shores. The Episcopalians were elbowing out those ministers who had held sway in Cromwell's time, and Pepys, who had been time-serving enough to make a show of Puritanism, is rather scathing when he has to mention the latter.

22nd (January), Lord's Day. To church in the afternoon to Mr. Herring, where a lazy, poor sermon. This day I began to put on buckles to my shoes.

A word of praise is given, too, whenever a preacher rails against the Puritans. At Whitehall Chapel in 1663,

Dr. Creighton, the Scotsman, preached a most admirable, good and learned and most severe sermon, yet comically, upon the words of the woman: "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee" He railed bitterly, ever and anon, against John Calvin and his breed, the Presbyterians, and against the present terms now in use of "tender consciences." He ripped up the preaching of Hugh Peters, calling him "the execrable skellum."

Rather easy, we think, to hit people who are down, and Hugh Peters had been hanged nearly three years before!

Pepys was one of the party that went to fetch King Charles II, but, though he was wholly in favour of the new order of things, the moral and other delinquencies of that monarch soon caused him grave concern. At the end of 1662 we find him lamenting:

The King, in the meantime, is following his pleasure more than with good advice he would do, at least to be seen to all the world to do so. His dalliance with my Lady Castlemaine being publick every day to his great reproach, and his favouring none at court so much as those who are the confidants of his pleasure, which God put it into his heart to amend before he makes himself too much contemned by his people for it.

Only two years before, he had set down:

Fell a-reading of the tryalls of the late men that were hanged (10) for the king's death and found good satisfaction thereof.

In the course of the diary we see how the "Anabaptists" and "Fanatiques", whoever Pepys may include under those terms, were being kept from office in the navy, and how the Presbyterians were being ejected from the Church.

On the 17th August, 1662, we have Pepys as an eye-witness of the

farewell of Dr. Bates at St. Dunstan's, and of Mr. Herring at St. Bride's, Fleet Street, with extracts from their sermons; but Pepys is fearful that "the bishops will not long be able to carry it so high".

Presently, on a certain "Lord's day":

I saw several poor creatures carried by, by constables, for being at a conventicle. They go like lambs, without any resistance. I would to God they would either conform or be more wise and not be caught!

A characteristic note is found in 1664:

2nd of October, Lords Day . . . I intended to have seen the Quakers, who, they say, do meet every Lord's Day at the Mouth in Bishopsgate; but I could see none stirring nor was it fit to ask the way to the place; so I walked over Moorfields and thence to Clerkenwell Church, and there, as I wished, sat next pew to the fair Butler, who indeed, is a most perfect beauty still, and I do very much admire myself for my choice of her for a beauty, having the best lower part of her face that ever I saw all the days of my life.

As in our day, going to Church was sometimes for other things than the worship of God. This also has a modern ring:

After Church to walk in the Mall, to observe the fashions, my wife desiring to make some clothes.

Sometimes, it is to be feared, Church did little good to him.

Dec. 2nd, 1660. To Church, and Mr. Mills made a good sermon, so home to dinner. My wife and I alone to a leg of mutton; the sawce of which being made sweet, I was angry at it and eat none, but only dined upon the marrow bone that we had beside.

25th, Xmas Day. In the morning to Church where Mr. Mills made a good sermon. Home to dinner to a good shoulder of mutton and a chicken. After dinner to Church again where we had a dull sermon of a stranger that made me sleep.

But was it the sermon?

There is probably no book in our, or any, language with so wide a use of adjectives as applied to sermons. A few samples may be given, but there are many more.

Mr. Mossum made a good sermon but only too eloquent for a pulpit. The Bishop of Chichester preached before the King and made a great flattering sermon.

. . . . listened to a cold sermon of the Bishop of Salisbury's.

Dr. Spurstow preached a poor dry sermon.

Dr. Crofts made an indifferent sermon.

Heard Mr. Thos. Fuller preach at the Savoy upon our forgiving other mens trespasses, shewing among other things, that we are to go to law never to revenge but only to repayre; which I think a good distinction.

A most tedious, unreasonable and impertinent sermon by an Irish doctor. His text was: "Scatter them, O Lord, that delight in warre." Sir W. Batten and I very much angry with the parson.

A stranger preached a good, honest and painfull sermon.

At church, where a stranger preached like a fool.

Mr. Jacomb, of Ludgate, made a gracy sermon, like a Presbyterian. At St. Paul's: A good sermon of Dr. Bucke's, one that I never heard before.

To church, where a sleepy Presbyterian preached.

To church, and heard a simple fellow upon the praise of church musique and exclaiming against men's wearing their hats in church.

To Church again and slept part of the sermon.

To Church, where a most insipid young coxcomb preached.

A most excellent and eloquent sermon, but in the evening our navy chaplain preached a sad sermon, full of nonsense and false Latin.

To Westminster, and into St. Margarets, where I heard a young man play the fool upon the doctrine of purgatory.

With my wife to Church, where we have not been these nine or ten weeks. A young simple fellow did preach; slept soundly all the sermon.

Mr. Fuller, at Barking Church, preached well and neatly. To bed without prayers, it being cold and to-morrow washing day.

The use of Sunday, as revealed by the diary, provides an interesting study. Pepys himself, as well as attending church, usually made up his personal accounts; and we see his savings growing steadily, chiefly by his acceptance of bribes from captains and contractors in connexion with the navy. We see tailors delivering garments, a great deal of work done at the office, and a great deal of drinking and merrymaking at home. Apprentices riot in the streets, duels are fought in the fields and pleasure boats of all kinds are on the Thames, while on one occasion at least the whole household is called at 4 a.m. "to get the washing done".

The great plague is heralded by the entry of 3rd July, 1665 :

The season growing so sickly that it is much to be feared how a man can escape having a share with others in it; for which the Lord God bless me! or make me fitted to receive it.

He goes to reside at Greenwich but comes to London daily for his work at the Admiralty, even on fast days being there "at great advantage", he says, "because all is quiet". Strange that a man who is superstitious enough to carry a hare's foot as a safeguard against the colic, and brings God's name into most of his reflections, should take such little account of solemn fasts declared for the staying of the plague.

Enough has been said, however, to shew that the religion of Samuel Pepys was a strange mixture of self-congratulation, sermon-tasting, and superstition, though not without a touch of real godliness that found expression in family worship and in a deep appreciation of the best thought of his time.

The preacher who is most prominent in his pages is "Mr. Mills", Dr. Daniel Mills, to give him his due, who was for thirty-two years rector of St. Olave's, Hart Street. He is at first described by Pepys as "a very good minister", but comes in for some severe criticism later on. Most of his sermons, however, are described as "good", though occasionally there is another note.

Apr. 29th, 1666, To Church, where Mr. Mills a lazy sermon on the Devil's having no right to anything in this world.

We may wonder whether to praise or blame him for the shrewdness shewn in the following :

18th Oct., 1663. The parson, Mr. Mills, I perceive, did not know whether to pray for the Queen or no, and so said nothing about her; which makes me think she is dead.

Pepys, too, is shrewd, for three days later we find :

This morning, hearing that the Queen grows worse again, I sent to stop the making of my velvet cloak till I see whether she lives or dies.

The diary comes to an untimely end with 31st May, 1669, on a note of sadness; as, with his eyesight gradually failing him, he is driven to resolve to have kept for him a journal wherein only those things shall be entered that are "fit for all the world to know".

And so I betake myself to that course which is almost as much as to see myself go into the grave; for which and all the discomforts that will accompany my being blind, the good God prepare me.

The worst, however, did not happen, and for thirty-four years after this he lived a full life. But the diary, having been once broken, was not, so far as is known, resumed again.

D. J. SHEPPARD.

FOREIGN IMPRESSIONS AND REVIEWS.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Evangelische Jugendwohlfahrt. von LEOPOLD CORDIER. Schwerin in Mecklenburg: FRIEDRICH BAHN. R.M. 20 and R.M. 24.

"The new spirit in education," says Dr. A. W. Harrison in an interesting article in the *Hibbert Journal* recently, "may be defined as the temper which is in revolt against the drill sergeant in the schools, which aims at the development of the individual along his own lines rather than at simultaneous class movements." The article in question is actually a review of M. Adolphe Ferrière's *Trois Pionniers de l'Éducation Nouvelle*. The first of the three pioneers is Hermann Lietz of Ilsenburg, a new Pestalozzi, who lived with his children after the manner of the master. "It was a little fellowship of joy and activity, but no orders were given. 'Hier giebt es keinen Befehl,' and Lietz, 'alles muss Sitte werden.' There were no punishments, children worked in school and in the fields, laughed and talked and played with the masters. Lietz, living and dressing like a peasant, was a true father to his growing family. The charm of the life came from the harmony of varied activities. Classes were short and interesting, broken up by intervals for making beds, games, work in the garden, or at the carpenter's bench. Music played a great part in the life of the school. There was chorus-singing for all, and the orchestra for the select musicians. Plays were given in the evenings out in the fields by the river. Religion had its influence in every part of the life, and the old Lutheran chants were sung, but there was no narrow and conventional representation of Christianity."

What was the result from the point of view of the cool outside critic who has to compare, with sympathy, but without bias, the results of such experiments with those of more conventional and traditional methods? "Generally speaking," said Lietz, "examiners have noticed that our scholars have a more solid general culture than those of the State schools, and show better judgment in scientific discussions. This is no doubt due to the fact that, while we may cram our scholars with fewer facts, we develop in them the power of sane judgment the better on that account."

It is impossible not to be struck by the likeness of these words of Lietz to the following significant passage from the conclusion to Prof. John Dewey's famous book, *Schools of To-morrow*. Speaking of the changes in the modern world which so imperatively call for corresponding changes in teaching method and matter he says: ". . . possibly most significant from the point of view of education is the incredible increase in the number of facts that must be part of the mental furniture of any one who meets even the ordinary situations of life successfully. But the schools, instead of facing this frankly and then changing their curriculum so that they could teach pupils how to learn from the world itself, have gone on bravely teaching as many facts as possible. But the change that is demanded by science is a more radical one. This includes not alone teaching of the scientific laws that have brought about the changes in society since their discovery, but (also) the substitution of real work, which itself teaches the facts of life, for the study and memorization of facts after they have been classified in books."

No doubt it is true that Dewey is thinking rather along American realist lines than, in the German way, of the more transcendental ideal of character-forming for its own sake. But is there any actual clash here in the end of the day? The farther I go, the less am I able to see or believe that science and religion (in the true and reverent sense of both words) contradict each other. It is only the travesty of science which finds an enemy in the travesty of religion. So the scientific educationist at his best in Dewey seems to present his ideal in almost the same words as the religious educationist at his best in Lietz. For the fearless search for truth is as much a characteristic of the great religious adventurers as reverence is of the great scientific teachers. And therefore we may and should expect that the atmosphere of reverence will also be that of research, of complete awareness and awakeness to the actual facts of the world in which we live. A well-known biologist has remarked that scientists no more like to be waked out of their dogmatic sleep than do theologians. But *such* scientists and *such* theologians are alike to be rejected; let us treat both classes as Virgil and Dante treated the dwellers in the vestibule of the Inferno :—

Fama di loro il mondo esser non lassa;
Misericordia e Giustizia gli sdegna:
Non ragionam di lor, ma guarda e passa.

The person who is truly religious, whose life is purged from pettiness and self-seeking, whose source of serenity and of action is rooted in the eternal; he is the truly efficient, whose mind is clarified from fixed ideas, who is ever ready to adjust himself to fresh circumstances with high courage and unclouded intelligence. Lietz adopted as his motto the epitaph of Fichte, *Licht, Liebe, Leben*. And we know that Fichte and Schelling loved especially Plato and the Fourth Gospel, that gospel which rings the changes on these three aspects of the eternal spirit, light, love, life, which we find too in the Mandæan mysticism so closely allied with John's teaching. So that, after all, the new education is still inspired by the essential motives of that transcendental and yet immanent idealism which blossomed so splendidly again and again in the greatest epochs of European thought and life.

The great educators of the sixteenth century were not otherwise minded, however their contemporaries may have imitated the harsh methods of Orbilius, whose ferrule Horace so feared and hated. After all, the classical tradition had Quintilian as its guide. The Orbilii of life, happily, seldom think out their own *rationale*, and still seldomer perpetuate their methods in treatises. The Orbilian method is to be sought rather in the *Soldier's Pocket Book* and its results in that horrible revelation, *A Private in the Guards*. Quintilian's memorial to his dead boy sprang from the fountain of tears, source at once gentle and strong. Beloved Roger Ascham was essentially of the classical school, and he could write a few years before 1571 :

I will now declare at large, why, in mine opinion, loue is fitter than feare, ientlenes better than beating, to bring vp a childe rightlie in learninge.

If your scholer do misse sometimes . . . chide not hastilie: for that shall both dull his witte, and discourage his diligence: but monish him gentelie: which shall make him both willing to amende, and glad to go forward in loue and hope of learning.

And his opinion, again, is most clearly and plainly in accord with that of Lietz and of Dewey, as Mayor rightly points out in the introduction to his edition of *The Schoolmaster* :

Ascham, however, had rightly a very moderate estimation of that sort of learning which can be taught by voice or book, and passively received into the memory. With as little of pugnacity or indocility as ever belonged to a lively and enquiring mind, he held fast the truth, that it is only by its own free agency that the intellect can either be enriched or invigorated; his favourite maxim was *docendo discas*. The necessity of being intelligible to others brings with it an obligation to understand ourselves.

By its own free agency. These words will at once rouse the suspicion of some and the antagonism of others, who will reflect that after all we do need to make sure that we are not giving in to a method which will prove centrifugal, will develop the individual in such a way as to produce rebels and eccentrics. To such it may be pointed out that it is far easier to produce a conventional type than it is to stimulate originality. "Men," as Stanley Ortheris remarked, "are sheep, bloomin' sheep," whilst changing life calls aloud for the adaptable and adapting and often makes holocausts of the conventional. The man who is really valuable to the community is the one whose own powers have ripened slowly and steadily. And the sixteenth century knew this too. In a book better known to the expert educationist than to the layman, but by him rated far above Ascham's masterpiece, Richard Mulcaster wrote, in 1581, in his *Positions* :

I am specially to further two degrees in learning, first the Elementarie . . . then the Grammarian . . . the Elementarie: Bycause sufficiency in the child, before he passe thence helps the hole course of the after studie, and insufficiencie skipping from thence to soone, makes a very weake sequele. For . . . sufficient time there, without to much hast, to post from thence to timely, draweth on the residew of the schoole degrees, in their best beseeing time, and in the end sendeth abroad sufficient men for the service of their countrie. And is not this pointe then to be well proyned, where hast is such a foe, and ripeness such a freind?

Apart from the charm of 16th century diction, is there not here a valuable protest against that hot-house forcing of information and facts of which there is to-day so much? How often is it proved true that insufficiency, skipping from thence too soon, makes a very weak sequel?

But it may be asked how far we are justifying our title. We have said much of education, little or nothing of what is usually understood by the term religious education. Perhaps, however, the ordinary signification of the term is not its best meaning. Not the instilling of a knowledge of certain stories, certain theological notions, but the total process of *leading out* and developing the child's mind in a religious atmosphere is alone worthy to be described as religious education. Just a little later than Mulcaster's time George Herbert wrote that

A servant with this clause, Makes drudgery divine;
Who sweeps a room, as for Thy laws, Makes it and th' action fine.

Such is the spirit animating all three of M. Ferrière's pioneers, the second of whom is the Sicilian Signore Lombardo-Radice, for five years (1907-1912) editor of the educational review which he founded, *Nuovi Doveri*, and now Director of Public Education in Italy under Signore Gentile. The principles which he taught abroad he practised in his own home, and if the good results were attributed to the special advantages his own children enjoyed, he would say, "I believe in the creative capacity of every child. Every child is a poet, an artist, a sculptor, a singer, a botanist, a theologian, a philosopher—what you will, after the fashion of a child. It is we grown-up people who block the avenues of the spirit." How true that is, that we all tend to get sclerosis of the mind so very soon. The third pioneer, Frantisek Bakule, of the famous school for crippled children at Prague, was nearly overborne by this mental sclerosis on the part of well-

meaning educational authorities. A curriculum was demanded from Bakule by the Board of Education of the then (1913) government. He supplied one, but never attempted to work to it. The story of how his apparently hopeless and helpless children were given hope and life and interest and ability is a fascinating one.

I thought no more about the school and its curriculum, but I kept seeking, seeking without rest, the ways along which the members of my community might escape from the flames and the darkness of the hell of their mind and be led to their proper place in society.

Could they make baskets, or cupboards, or rebind books? Yes, if they were taught. So the teacher had to set himself to learn these new employments, and he could never allow himself to dawdle in his own lessons, for the whole crowd would want to know what progress the master had made during the day. The schoolroom was then turned into a workshop.

Thus in Germany, in Italy, in Bohemia, the same spirit is breaking out again, and best of all, it is lovingly recorded by a Frenchman. Germany and Italy and the former Austrian countries were of course the great cultural area of the later Middle Ages, and felt themselves to have a unity of civilization as the Holy Roman Empire. The way in which they are still producing fresh ideas and experiments, or fresh forms of sound old ideas, in spite of the apparent barrier of the differing linguistic districts, is very significant and charged with hope for the future. The same criticism of course applies, as is applied to Froebel by John Adams in his *Herbartian Psychology* :—

Not philosophy, but common sense, experience, and loving observation have led Froebel and his followers to adopt certain methods which are excellent in themselves, and which in capable hands produce admirable results. For this he deserves all the honour which has been heaped upon him—but he has not explained *John*. As a psychology it [Froebelianism] is simply non-existent. It suggests the immense importance of knowing *John*; which is much. It leaves to others the task of supplying this knowledge.

And further on in the same book the author attempts to supply this lack. In an interesting passage, for example, he shows how we should apply the principle of "universes of discourse," as the logicians say, to the endeavour to understand what is going on in the child's mind. Thus,

At church, at Sunday-school, in the country during vacation, *John* enters a new world, where new ideas find a place and old ideas find a new place and a new meaning. The same idea varies with the world in which it finds itself. In school the idea of *pigeon* has to hobnob with disagreeable ideas of object lessons and the number of vertebrae in birds. In Sunday-school it takes up with Noah's Ark; at home it may deal with the delights of the backyard dove-cote or the charms of a certain class of pie; in the country it may form the centre of a system of snares.

All this is true, and yet every experienced teacher knows that, as a matter of hard fact, those who are most acute at demonstrating the nature of the child's psychological processes are far from always being the best teachers in practice. The personal element is such an important factor, and intellectual ability and training, however valuable—and they are valuable—cannot avail where love and sympathy are lacking. No amount of pedagogical training will make a self-centred intellectual into a good teacher. There's a *je ne sais quoi* which must be there, part of the personality.

And, now that we have tried to show how we must be interested Europeans if we are to keep abreast of the most progressive and healthy ideas in this, the most important of all efforts, the education of the coming generation in an atmosphere of reverent intelligence, let us turn to Herr

Cordier's immense mass of evidence, the book whose title we originally quoted. A mass of evidence is really the best description of this immense tome. The well-known German theological review, the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, rightly described it as a vastly industrious collection of data for a thesis on the subject of Protestant education in Germany during and since Luther's time. It is really impossible to separate religious education from secular education. The origins of modern European and American teaching traditions are to be found in the desire to bring up children as intelligent Christians, just as all the older universities—and this is true, too, of Harvard and Yale—were originally religious foundations. In his *History of Education* Adamson opens with the following passage:—

Modern public education has a two-fold origin which dates back to the early days of Christianity. Its various institutions, schools, colleges, universities and the framework of administration are the creation of the Christian Church. The Church's desire to master the significance of the Scriptures, and to propagate their teaching, maintained the connexion between Christian education and the system of rhetorical instruction which flourished under the pagan Roman empire. As a consequence two conflicting elements existed in the curriculum which the Middle Ages bequeathed to posterity. The primary object of early medieval learning was a thorough understanding of the Bible. But any sufficient study of the Latin language involved an acquaintance with Latin literature.

Thus two elements which disliked and feared one another quite as much as cheap science and pedantic religion do to-day are inextricably intertwined in our European-American educational traditions. My own belief is that the old culture areas of Central Europe are far more likely to be fecund sources of sound new ideas about this matter than is the objective pioneer spirit of the descendants of European immigrants in North America. For pioneer spirits are usually of what the Americans call an *extrovert* type. To survive in such an environment they must necessarily be intelligent rather than reflective, men of action rather than thought. Hence the reproach of materialism so commonly, though often very unjustly, levelled at the mentality of the newer countries. It is only in old populations where tradition has full weight that the most fruitful ideas are likely to arise, apart of course from technical inventions, which demand the quick sagacity of the activist rather than brooding reflexion. Thus it is that Luther, a natural conservative in the very best sense, and yet in another sense far more modern than Calvin—for the release from superstition comes through Luther the psychological rather than Calvin the logical—is rightly quoted in a mass of material which also includes the maxims of Pestalozzi. The two greatest interests of Luther were, in fact, the economic and educational problems of society—the fights against poverty and ignorance. To him these were evangelical tasks in the most direct sense. And his methods were *in essence* far ahead of those of the Calvinists. Their organization was admirable; their psychology deplorable. For Calvin, the lawyer, remained essentially a scholastic. Lawyer and scholastic deal with men in the mass. To Luther, that great student of Augustine, the first European psychologist, was revealed the meaning of personality. And his plans for social betterment worked out eventually in the Elberfeld-Barmen poor relief measures, as his educational ideals did in Froebel and Pestalozzi.

Yea, sayest thou, all such sayings [*Matt.* 18^{6f}] are said to parents; what has that to do with councillors and the government? Well said, in truth. Yea, but if the parents do it not? Who is to do it then? Is it to remain undone and the children to be ruined? Where will councillors and administration find an excuse for not having undertaken this duty? For there are manifold reasons why parents do not carry it out.

And after explaining these at some length, dilating on the poverty and ignorance of many parents, he continues :

Therefore 'tis a proper duty of the council and administration to have the greatest care and zeal with regard to the young folk. For since the goods, honour, bodies and life of the whole city are committed to their faithful hands, they would not act with integrity before God and the world if they did not seek the prosperity and improvement of the city day and night with all their power. Now the prosperity of a city does not lie alone in the evidence of great treasure, strong walls, fine houses and plenty of arquebuses and armour, indeed where there is abundance of these things and emptyheaded fools over and above, there is so much the more dreadful and mighty shame to that city; but the best and most abundant prosperity, well-being and power of a city lie in its having many goodly, scholarly, reasonable, honourable, well-educated citizens, who are therefore well able to gather, retain and make right use of treasure and everything good.

Thus Luther, whose evangelical faith was to him part and parcel, nay, the inspiring motive of his zeal for education. To the religious man education is essentially a religious duty. Religion cannot be taught, for it is not a set of facts. But it can be imparted. And what is more, if we are irreligious ourselves, however we may prate of the Bible or the Church, we shall educate our children in irreligion. Which sort of education they will absorb depends on our own characters. So, to finish with more Luther :

For since a city ought to and must have people, and everywhere the greatest breach, lack, and complaint is, that there are no people, we must not wait for them to grow up (we can neither hew them from stone, nor carve them from wood): God will not work miracles, so long as man can manage his affairs with the gifts God has bestowed. Therefore we must buckle to, and spare no trouble and expense, to educate and form them.

J. P. NAISH.

The Mind of the Savage. By RAOUL ALLIER. Bell. 15s.

The French edition of this work, *Le Non-civilisé et Nous*, was reviewed in *The Congregational Quarterly* (VI. 374f). The present translation is accurate and reads well. The publishers have done wisely in making more accessible a book that no missionary or student of the primitive forms of religion can afford to neglect. It is the best reply so far to the French sociological school of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl.

A. C. UNDERWOOD.

Herr Ludwig Klages is well-known in Germany as a psychologist, and his book, *The Science of Character* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.), which has been well translated by Mr. W. H. Johnston, is one of his latest and most characteristic writings. It is a real contribution to what is now known as characterology, and traces the development of personality and the sources of morality from the purely psychological and scientific standpoint.

M. Jean Piaget's *The Child's Conception of the World* (Kegan Paul, 12s. 6d.) is one of the more recent volumes in the International Library of Psychology, Philosophy, and Scientific Method, and is a sequel to two previous volumes by the same author on the *Development of Language and Reasoning in Children*. M. Piaget is a real authority on the subject and his book will be invaluable both to parents and teachers and to any others who are concerned with the study of child life.

W. B. SELBIE.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London, and the date 1929 unless otherwise stated.)

Daniel O'Connell, *The Irish Liberator*. By DENIS GWYNN. Hutchinson. 18s.

Lord Lansdowne. By LORD NEWTON, P.C. Macmillan. 25s.

Elizabeth Barrett Browning: *Letters to her Sister, 1846-1859*. Murray. 21s.

The Life of George Meredith. By R. E. SENCOURT. Chapman & Hall. 16s.

The Garden of Fidelity: The Autobiography of Flora Annie Steel, 1847-1929. Macmillan. 12s. 6d.

Six Great Anglicans. By F. W. HEAD, B.D. S.C.M. 6s.

The Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Clifford Allbutt, K.C.B.: *A Memoir*. By Sir HUMPHRY DAVY ROLLESTON, Bart., K.C.B. Macmillan. 15s.

Memories of My Life. By EDWARD WESTERMARCK. Allen & Unwin. 16s.

Livingstone. By R. J. CAMPBELL, D.D. Benn. 21s.

Captain Scott. By STEPHEN GWYNN. Bodley Head. 12s. 6d.

All the books before us deal with Victorians, although O'Connell reached his zenith before the Queen's accession, and Scott's sublime hours came after her death. A galaxy like this one must dazzle the arrogant youngsters of the Georgian era, if they have eyes to see at all. But already there are signs that condescension to the Victorian age is on the wane.

The centenary of Catholic Emancipation seems to have brought much work to Mr. Denis Gwynn. Recently we received his *A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation*; we refer to his biography of Cardinal Wiseman in our present Editorial; and now before us is this intensely interesting and well written life of Daniel O'Connell, one of the most striking demagogues Ireland or any other country has ever known.

Mr. Gwynn's sympathy with the Liberator compels the reader's sympathy too, sometimes against his judgment, for we cannot but be often repelled by the coarseness of O'Connell's invective, his bombast, and his almost invariable use of "personalities". But with his rise to power, his conquest over many difficulties in his profession, and the courage with which he faced many enemies and with which he refused to sanction an appeal to force, we cannot but sympathize, nor can we help regretting the long years of anti-climax after the Emancipation, when new men with new views came to the fore and the Liberator's power gradually decayed.

There are misprints on pp. 24 and 228.

Lord Newton has been wise to compress his biography of Lord Lansdowne into one volume—a well illustrated book of some 500 pages. On the whole it is a competent piece of work, though we think the first half benefits by being free from the partisanship that marks the years

when Lord Newton himself began to play a part in political life—the references to Haldane, *e.g.*, are sometimes both superfluous and unworthy.

Lord Lansdowne was perhaps the last of the patricians, a *grand seigneur*, with old-time courtesy and immense dignity, and with a sense of duty and public service which sent him from the homes and the land he loved to be Governor-General of Canada and then Viceroy of India, and finally brought him back to the War Office and the Foreign Office in turn. As a statesman Lord Lansdowne must be put among the good second classes: if history lifts him to the first class it will be for the Lansdowne Letter of 1917, the publication of which showed him to possess both foresight and courage. He stands out as perhaps the best representative in our own time of the public-school, English-gentleman type, with its virtues and its limitations: there were many things he would never stoop to do, while it is typical and significant that, we believe we are right in saying, there is not a single mention of religion and his attitude to spiritual things in the biography.

Once more we cannot but be struck by the part played by the monarch in public affairs. Queen Victoria's interference, especially in regard to military matters, is constant, and her references to Gladstone as abominable as usual. In 1887 she writes to Lord Lansdowne, then Governor-General of Canada:—

The Queen fears Lord Lansdowne must have had many troubles to contend with, including those in his own Irish property. He will have followed with interest and disgust the accounts of the debates on the Crimes Bill and the language and conduct of the Irish, and not only of them, but of Mr. Gladstone and a few others. It is dreadful to see a man who was three times Prime Minister fall so low! But fortunately his influence has greatly diminished, and especially in this country there is a great change.

And this is how the impartial constitutional monarch speaks of the elections of 1892:—

She feels more than ever at this painful, anxious moment when, by an incomprehensible, reckless vote, the result of most unfair and abominable misrepresentations at the elections, one of the best and most useful Governments have [*sic*] been defeated—how important it is to have so able and reliable a Viceroy in India.

The Queen-Empress can hardly trust herself to say what she feels and thinks on the subject. Apart from the pain of parting from some great personal friends and people whom she can trust and rely on, the danger to the country, to Europe, to her vast Empire, which is involved in having all these great interests entrusted to the shaking hand of an old, wild, and incomprehensible man of 82½, is very great! It is a terrible trial, but, thank God, the country is sound, and it cannot last. The Gladstonian majority is quite divided, and solely depends on the Irish vote.

There is, however, a most interesting letter from Lord Balfour which makes clear that Edward VII had little to do with foreign politics, and did not deserve the reputation he had of being both an astute and a successful diplomat.

Anything relating to the Brownings is welcome, but we must confess that these new letters are a sugary dose. In the love letters Robert's robustness and commonsense make the correspondence palatable; these letters to her sister Henrietta make us realize what "Ba" would have been like had Robert never come her way and set his true love free. In one of her letters she admits that "Peni's fault"—she admits, very few in the paragon child—"presently will be some excess of sentimentalism", and we cannot wonder after reading these letters.

In them we have much about clothes, about Peni, and Henrietta's children, and about the sister Arabel: a good deal too about spiritualism—on which subject the two poets had to agree to differ—and about Italian politics. Mrs. Browning does not shine as a politician: she believed in Louis Napoleon and thought the Crimean "a most righteous and necessary war". Altogether these ultra-feminine letters afford the least pleasing picture of Mrs. Browning we have yet seen. She is always wanting to manage the affairs of her sisters, and to bring up Henrietta's children for her, and there is something the least bit "catty" about her comparison of her own child with his cousins. But the sight of the happiness which resulted from a marriage that could only be called extremely risky will gratify all Browning lovers, who will enjoy glimpses of many celebrities—Carlyle, Tennyson, and the Prince of Wales among them.

Dr. Leonard Huxley has performed the editor's task with modest efficiency, but we should like to venture two conjectural emendations—*her* for *here* on p. 21, and *hap* for *get* on p. 70.

Mr. J. B. Priestley's volume in the "English Men of Letters" series and Mrs. Sturge Gretton's study have been noticed in these pages, but Mr. R. E. Sencourt's claims to be the authoritative biography. It is a competent piece of work, and it is timely, for it is probably in the present generation that the fate of Meredith's writings will be determined—certainly it is but rarely that we meet readers of either the novels or the poems in these days, although it might have been expected that the poems would have a vogue.

Mr. Sencourt's weaknesses are a love of fine writing and an enthusiasm for his subject which results in extravagant claims, such as: "Here (*Richard Feverel*) the beauty is richer, and the tragedy more intimate, than in *Romeo and Juliet*" (p. 65); "The whole country recognized the passing of the greatest of her writers"; "a writer who, at his best, was not less than supreme".

On the whole, however, the book is sound in its narrative of the life, and suggestive in its criticism of the works. It fails to convince us that Meredith had not a good deal of the snob in him, but it does show us a red-blooded individual who was not afraid to live life to the full.

The world is poorer for the passing of Mrs. Steel, who died a few months ago. It is a matter for thankfulness, however, that she had practically finished her autobiography, one of the liveliest and raciest books of its kind we have met. Mrs. Steel retained into the eighties the vigour of mind and charm of character that moulded her life, and it appears in these pages, whether they are describing unusual experiences in India, or more commonplace life in this country. Her achievements as a novelist, a fighter for the rights of women, and for women's education, are well-known, but it is exceptionally interesting to read her own account of them, to learn of her motives, and hear the outspoken expression of her views. Her frankness got her into and out of many a scrape, but it won for her the affection and respect of many in both the lands in which she spent her life.

With such frankness as her main characteristic it is remarkable that Mrs. Steel contrived to write her autobiography without revealing her maiden name! The book is delightful reading and is packed with good stories. We must make room for one about an English quartermaster posted on one of the captured German ships in Scapa Flow. To him a German quartermaster said, as they leaned over the rail: "I sinks nos'ing of your ships." No reply. "And I sinks nos'ing of your sailors." Still

no reply. "And I sinks nos'ing of your officers, your Jellicoes, your Beattys —", spitting over the rail. The Englishman turned and said, "Now! Look ee 'ere, I don't care a tinker's dam wot you thinks about our ships, our sailors, and our officers, but don't you go spittin' into our sea".

We find Canon Head's a most disappointing book. Its six studies of Simeon, Keble, Hook, Robertson, Kingsley, and Barnett are lectures on pastoral theology delivered in Cambridge. The book at one and the same time attempts to do three things: (1) to give an account of the life and work of six men; (2) to offer practical suggestions for parish priests based on these accounts; (3) to link the lives together and show the relation of the English Church to national affairs during the nineteenth century. Any one of these three lines might have made a useful book. As it is, we have naïve comments upon political history, and extracts from sermons, and disquisitions on preaching and Sabbath observance, all rolled together. And so very often the new Archbishop of Melbourne bestrides the hedge and refuses to come down on one side or the other. There is a wordy vagueness about it all which is too often found in Church dignitaries of all denominations, witness, *e.g.*, the sentences about eternal punishment on p. 208, or the classification together of Gladstone, Disraeli, Shaftesbury, and Kingsley as "social reformers".

"When we were very young" the name of Allbutt was commonly spoken round about us with bated breath in which awe and admiration mingled: the reason maybe is to be found in the medical joke that "no good Yorkshireman would rest quietly in his grave if, before his death, he had not been seen by Clifford Allbutt".

Born in Dewsbury Vicarage in 1836, Allbutt read science and then medicine at Cambridge. In 1861 he settled in Leeds and did not leave until 1889, by which time he had established a more than national reputation. After three years as Commissioner in Lunacy, he was appointed Regius Professor of Physic in Cambridge, which Chair he held until his death in 1925. Right to the end he possessed a mind alert and tolerant, an outlook broad and sympathetic. English medicine was indeed fortunate to have as occupants of its two main teaching posts men like Allbutt and Osler, masters in their own craft and calling, but also respected for their gifts of scholarship and style, and still more for their character and service.

Sir Humphry Rolleston, Allbutt's successor at Cambridge, has given us an excellent biography, though he is far from having Allbutt's literary skill. His method of dividing the life into years and treating it chronologically tends to jerkiness, while sometimes "he" refers back to a mention of Allbutt a page before. Nevertheless the book is very readable, and—while doctors will find it especially useful—we hope laymen will not be deterred from reading it by the abundance of medical terms, for Allbutt, the man, is greater than all his work. His advice to students is characteristic and may well close this short notice:

"Never waste—even five minutes; always have something on your desk that you can do between lectures, before hall, and while waiting for a friend. Finish everything up as you go; leave no loose ends. *Never rest*, except in sleep; change your occupations."

We warmly welcome the translation of Dr. Westermarck's *Memories*, which appeared in Swedish last year. Born in Finland, dividing much of his life between professorships in London and in his native land, visiting Morocco twenty-one times and staying there in all seven years, Dr. Westermarck's life contains variety enough to make the narrative

extremely readable and interesting. And then it must be remembered that to his pioneer work in sociology and anthropology Dr. Westermarck added an ardent patriotism—he set forth Finland's case at Geneva in the dispute with Sweden about the Åland Islands. The description of research in Morocco will probably be found the most pleasing part of the book, though the reader will share the writer's delight in his English home at Box Hill.

Our main impression on reading the book is of the difficulty a stranger finds in understanding a life and thought alien to him. Dr. Westermarck's summary of English manners and conventions shows how little he understood a new *milieu*, and one cannot but feel the same about his references to Christianity. He was never inside it, and his comments on matters like the problem of evil show that he has never got beyond an elementary acquaintance with theological thought. Here Dr. Westermarck is but in the same position as many men of science: if they would give the same amount of thought to the study of religion at its best as they do to its manifestations among primitive peoples, their conclusions might be different. It is a strange science that dissects the acorn and is blind to the oak.

One has only to think of Professor Coupland's *Livingstone on the Zambesi* to see how far Dr. R. J. Campbell falls short as a biographer. His genius lies in other directions, and we cannot help wishing that the publishers had left him free for what he can do so well, and invited, say, Professor Coupland to undertake to write the life of Livingstone. Dr. Campbell has had the advantage of unpublished material in writing his biography, but we have to confess that we did not get the thrill from it that we have received from smaller *Lives*. We have the impression as we read that the biographer warmed to his work as he went along: at any rate we found the second half of the book much easier going than the first. We are glad to find that Dr. Campbell gives us Livingstone, warts and all; the explorer was no plaster saint, and it is well to see him as he really was.

We are glad that Mr. Waldman has not confined his "Golden Hind" series to mariners and adventurers of Elizabethan days, and we have greatly enjoyed Mr. Stephen Gwynn's life of Captain Scott. The biography lacks nothing in polish, and it is written with a throb and zest that harmonize well with its subject.

Of course, Mr. Gwynn cannot improve on Scott's own words, some of them so familiar and stirring that thousands, knowing them by heart, have been inspired to courageous endeavour and arduous enterprise: but the parts of the biography dealing with Scott's early years and his life in the navy will be fresh to many. Captain Scott was one of the finest type of Englishmen: strong and sturdy, absolutely conscientious, with an impelling conception of life as duty and service. With these qualities he combined a sensitiveness and a literary skill unusual in one of his training and profession.

His life remains a call and a challenge—and we are grateful to Mr. Gwynn for telling the story of it in so appropriate and telling a manner.

EDITOR.

God. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. Cape. 10s. 6d.

Time and time and time again in reading this book we have been reminded of R. J. Campbell in the "New Theology" days. There is the same winsome appeal, the same wistful, earnest searching, the same attractiveness, about it all. Here, we say, is an absolutely sincere man who has passed through deep waters manfully fighting his way to firm ground. There is, too, the same petulance; the same perversity; the same

childish delight in saying things he knows will provoke ("Luther and Calvin were rudimentary"); the same apparent playing with crucial topics (as in the pages which introduce D. H. Lawrence); the same belief that the teaching is something new and strange, sometimes stated with naïve arrogance ("the book claims to be a significant organic variation in the metabiological mode"; "the combination of mystical experience and a congenital intellectualism such as mine happens to be rare"; "implicit in the system of this book, is a system as coherent as Orthodoxy and more true".)

And just as, listening to Campbell preach, we used to feel that he was arguing out before his people the problems that confront most theological students while still in college, even so we feel in reading Mr. Murry.

That does not mean, of course, that Mr. Murry does not approach such problems from the point of view of his peculiar experience and see them from an unusual slant. His book must be read in the light of the autobiography which forms its early pages, and of Katherine Mansfield's *Letters and Journal*; in the light, too, of his previous books, *To the Unknown God* and *The Life of Jesus*. The autobiography wins the reader's sympathy: the other books show the stones already worked into the edifice Mr. Murry is building. (He has by no means finished yet, though he seems to think so. To change the figure, the gap made by Mr. Chesterton may be wide enough to admit Mr. Murry even as it has admitted Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith.)

Mr. Murry says he has been "a God-seeker, and a God-finder, and a God-denier", these being in ascending order. God "is nothing but a means of perpetuating the variations which are called values", "a calculus for accurate description. The calculus is no longer acceptable"—and for it Mr. Murry substitutes the simpler calculus, "organism" or "Life". The "creation of the Christian God" is one of the greatest achievements of humanity, but it is a real danger that to-day men should believe in Him, for, of course, to Mr. Murry God is but a projection of "man's progress towards inward order" and "man was for ever passing beyond the God whom he had created".

How a mystical experience started Mr. Murry on his quest: how the similarity between such an experience and an anæsthetic condition helped to develop his thought; how he finds "metabiological coherence in the life of Jesus" (metabiology, by the way, is "biology into which what are known as 'values' are organically incorporated") whose "creative newness . . . was inevitably death to the biological individual, but it was Life to the process as a whole"—all these we must leave readers to find out for themselves in a remarkable book. We shall be surprised if sympathy and antipathy do not frequently alternate as they read: but throughout, whether they agree or challenge, they will be made to think. And we shall be surprised if most of them do not wonder whether Mr. Murry has any sense of humour. We hope he will not think us flippant when we say we wish his book had any sign that he could laugh at himself: we really think he should make a practice of seeing or reading *What Every Woman Knows* at least once every year. EDITOR.

The Testament of Beauty. A Poem in Four Books. By ROBERT BRIDGES.
Oxford Press. 7s. 6d.

It would be far easier to write a long article on the Poet Laureate's poem than to write a short review: one wants to discuss the format, the "simplified spelling", the poetry, and, perhaps most of all, Dr. Bridges's philosophy, quoting as one goes along. But that is as impossible as it is impossible to characterize these four books of free alexandrines in which

Dr. Bridges sees the Spirit of Man, with Reason as Charioteer, driving the horses Selfhood and Breed, the Charioteer's relation to Beauty, Friendship, and Christ being revealed as the work proceeds.

The poem is strangely uneven. Sometimes Latin and Greek are invoked to help; sometimes we have lines like

The ground-root folly of this pitous philanthropy
is thinking to distribute indivisibles,
and make equality in things incommensurable:

or

. . . . like a hungry spider,
blindly spinneth her geometric webs, testing
and systematizing even her own disorders,
her solipsism and her gossamer ontologies
gnostic or cabbalist:

But then there are passages of real beauty, both of form and content. Of these we can quote two only :

So it was when Jesus came in his gentleness
with His divine compassion and great Gospel of Peace,
men hail'd him WORD OF GOD, and in the title of Christ
crown'd him with love beyond all earth-names of renown.
For He, wandering unarm'd save by the Spirit's flame,
in few years with few friends founded a world-empire
wider than Alexander's and more enduring;
since from his death it took its everlasting life.
HIS kingdom is God's kingdom, and his holy temple
not in Athens or Rome but in the heart of man.

'TWAS at thatt hour of beauty when the setting sun
squandereth his cloudy bed with rosy hues, to flood
his lov'd works as in turn he biddeth them good-night;
and all the towers and temples and mansions of men
face him in bright farewell, ere they creep from their pomp
naked beneath the darkness;—while to mortal eyes
'tis given, ifso they close not of fatigue, nor strain
at lamplit tasks—'tis given, as for a royal boon
to beggarly outcasts in homeless vigil to watch
where uncurtain'd behind the great windows of space
Heav'n's jewel'd company circleth unapproachably.

Dr. Bridges's scholarship ranges over every land and time : he discusses Alexander the Great and the recent excavations at Ur, prayer and class-hatred, Freud and Aristotle, and finds his illustrations in many a field. He leaves us bewildered, instructed, and grateful, and determined to turn to his pages again and again.

EDITOR.

The Holy Spirit from Arminius to Wesley. By HOWARD WATKIN-JONES, M.A., D.D. Sharp. 12s.

All serious students of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit have been indebted to Dr. Watkin-Jones for his continuation of Swete's historical work, in the volume entitled *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*, which appeared seven years ago. That book covered ten centuries, and this, which is only a few pages shorter, covers but two, the seventeenth and the eighteenth. This means that the treatment is much more detailed, and perhaps unnecessarily so ; the amount of attention given to Wesley's theological position seems disproportionate. The review is indeed chiefly concerned with English theologians of the period, and students will still find it necessary to use Noesgen's *Geschichte der Lehre vom heiligen Geiste* for the corresponding movement in Germany. But no history of

thought can ever be complete, and we can be grateful for this study, which puts before us in reliable summary or quotation the main points of discussion by writers whom few will have the time and inclination to consult at first hand. The plan of the book is to give a "Historical Introduction" covering the two centuries, and then to treat the subject topically, e.g., "The Godhead of the Spirit" or "The Spirit and the Human Will." (In the last connexion it may be noted that the author would exonerate Wesley from the charge of "Arminianism," except in the sense that he was anti-Calvinist.) The large amount of detail in the book makes it difficult, if not unprofitable, to read consecutively; but it will be indispensable to the student of the history of the doctrine. To the reconstructive side it makes no contribution.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

What do we Mean by God?
S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

By C. H. VALENTINE, M.A., Ph.D.

In this book Dr. C. H. Valentine has continued the argument for the objectivity of Christian experience which was developed in his *Modern Psychology and the Validity of Christian Experience*. The keynote of the book is the word "response." God means ultimate reality as responsive to human needs; man's response to responsive reality makes his religion. Reality must be personal to make such a response to the persons included in the system of reality. The nature of the response to human personality is redemptive.

The method of the book is to "begin with existent reality and attempt to demonstrate its suitability as the basis for the idea of God." The foundation of the argument is laid in Part I, whilst Part II deals with man's response to God, and Part III with God's response to man. The general conclusions will be acceptable to Christian theists, but not much attention is given to the difficulties of those who will not admit the religious responsiveness of the system of reality. It is doubtful whether the responsiveness on which the author stakes his case is an adequate category of the divine; this is seen, e.g., in the treatment of the Holy Trinity: we are told that "Monotheism is the substantive, the Trinity is adjectival" (p. 208), yet that, within Himself, "God is a perfect system of personal response" (p. 190), which certainly requires more than the adjective "responsive."

The book shows philosophic insight and patient thought, but it is unpardonably dull for such a theme. There is wearisome repetition, yet no clear outline of the course of the argument, and no sub-division of the chapters. The style is heavy, and the book will, it is to be feared, prove uninteresting to the general reader, who might have been helped by its argument.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Biblical Doctrines. By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. Oxford Press. 18s.

There are gathered together in this book a number of articles by the late Dr. Warfield, taken from various Bible Dictionaries, and dealing with themes ranging from Predestination to Eschatology. The most important are those treating of the Incarnation and the Atonement, each under a number of different aspects.

It is difficult to put into words the impression made by the book on a mind accustomed to modern methods in Biblical theology. It would be a mere impertinence to praise Dr. Warfield's learning, which appears on every page. Yet the whole result of it is to produce a singular feeling of unreality. The effect is much as if one had put on the "goloshes of Fortune" of Hans Andersen's fairy-tale and had been transported to the

seventeenth century. Dr. Warfield was Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton University. The very name recalls the great days of the Protestant orthodoxy, when a Reformed theologian like Alsted could write a "Theologia didactica" and a "Theologia polemica." Dr. Warfield might indeed be an Alsted *redivivus*, propounding what he believes to be truth with the same certainty, and attacking all enemies with the same courage. The adversaries, to be sure, are not those of an Alsted. They are no longer the Romanists, the Lutherans, and the Socinians. They are instead Liberal Protestants like Harnack and Sabatier, Anglo-Catholics like Rawlinson, and philosophers like Royce. However archaic Dr. Warfield may be in his positive theology, he is entirely up-to-date in his amazing knowledge of the views of his opponents.

It is not likely, however, that all his scholarship or his polemical energy will hinder the progress of modern thought. "So fight I," said St. Paul, "as one not beating the air." But that is just what Dr. Warfield does: he beats the air. He is like a soldier, thinking to repel an advancing cloud of gas by means of vigorous bayonet-thrusts or blows of the clubbed rifle. If his pre-suppositions were secure, his polemic might be successful. But it is just those pre-suppositions that the ineluctable movement of thought has rendered uncertain.

Dr. Warfield treats the Bible as a book of revealed knowledge, in itself certain and sufficient, quite apart from any interpretation through experience. All that is necessary is to make out the surface-meaning of the Biblical text, using indeed one part to explain another. The historical method simply does not exist for Dr. Warfield. He uses the *Epistle to the Hebrews* to settle the original meaning of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel in *Genesis*. He has no hesitation in accepting the Chalcedonian doctrine of the One Person in two natures as an accurate systematization of Biblical doctrine. His article on the Person of Christ contains no reference to the undoubted Adoptionism of the early chapters of *Acts*, or to the survivals of this primitive point of view still traceable in the midst of St. Paul's higher Christology.

Nevertheless, when all is said, there is instruction to be had from Dr. Warfield. His review of modern theories in the light of Calvinist orthodoxy is searching, and often successfully shows up their weaknesses; while his positive statements of Biblical doctrine, where they are not vitiated by complete lack of historical perspective, furnish much matter for reflexion. An experimental method in theology will necessitate a freer handling of the Biblical text, but anything that throws light on the text itself will assist the final synthesis.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Inward Vision. By R. H. J. STEWART, S.J. Longmans. 5s.

Pascal's Philosophy of Religion. By CLEMENT C. J. WEBB. Milford. 6s.

Kant's Conception of God. By F. E. ENGLAND, M.A., Ph.D. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

The Christian Apprehension of God. By H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.D. Student Christian Movement. 6s.

These four books have to a very considerable extent a common theme. All of them are concerned with God, and all but one are concerned with man's relation to God in religion. Taking them as they stand in the order above given, they represent four successive highly important phases of thought on the great subject common to them all.

Father Stewart's book has been placed first because its fundamental line of thought is the most ancient. It is meditational and devotional in

form, but the meditations it contains rest upon and reveal the solid outlines of the Thomist theology, which is now the universally accepted theology of the Roman Church. It is a noble theology, grand in its outlines and firmly knit together in its composition. It is a foundation that gives coherence and sequence to the thought of this book.

According to St. Thomas the first point of doctrine concerning God is that His essence is beyond all our thought. Yet He can be known through figures and symbols which shadow forth His Divine majesty. The purpose of Father Stewart's book is to exhibit how a number of such symbols lead us from different sides towards the vision of God. "To see through a symbol", he says, "is not to abolish it. . . To use symbols aright means, precisely, to let them point us to that for which they stand".

There is much in the book that is beautiful and helpful; and it may be read with profit by those who are not of the Roman communion.

Professor Webb's book on Pascal, which is a remarkably fine study of that most interesting character, brings before us a very different type of mentality. Pascal was a devout Catholic, but he lived in an age very different from that of St. Thomas. Instead of the Aristotelian physics from which the Thomist theology found its way to God with comparative ease, there had come into being the Cartesian physics with its strictly mathematical methods. Pascal was a first-class mathematician and scientist, but his very knowledge distressed him. It became clear to him that there was no direct way from mathematical science to God. He became the pioneer of what is now known as the argument from religious experience. One of the most celebrated of all his aphorisms is: "*Le cœur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît pas*". Another aphorism is: "*C'est le cœur qui sent Dieu et non la raison*".

Was Pascal a philosopher? Modern French thought assigns to him a philosophical position equal to that of Descartes. Professor Webb cannot find that he was strictly a philosopher at all. If it is the desire for a synoptic view of the universe that above all characterizes a philosopher, Pascal was untouched by this desire. Moreover, he quite unphilosophically at once identifies the revelation of God to the heart with the whole institution of the Roman Catholic Church.

Nevertheless Pascal remains to all time "a religious genius with a style of extraordinary distinction". In this aspect he will continue to engage the attention of subsequent generations. Such is Professor Webb's final verdict upon this fascinating personality.

The philosopher whose divided view of things most resembles that of Pascal is Immanuel Kant. Pascal's dualism of the reason and the heart has obvious affinities with Kant's dualism of the theoretical and the practical reason. Professor Webb admits this similarity, though he naturally points out how much more of a philosopher Kant was than Pascal. Kant's criticism of the theoretical proof for the Divine existence was closely reasoned in a manner quite unlike the aphoristic way of Pascal. Also Kant's practical reason was after all a form of reason: it was very different from Pascal's "*cœur qui sent Dieu*".

But still the dualism of Kant is only too evident, and has alienated many from the "Critical philosophy". In a book of real and outstanding merit Dr. England has set himself to draw together the lines of the Kantian philosophy, and to show that the consistent end of its criticism is a metaphysical doctrine of God as the ground of the universe and the principle of its teleology. Dr. England traces the development of modern philosophy from Descartes to Kant's *Critiques*, paying special attention to his immediate predecessors, Crusius and Baumgarten, and to Kant's own pre-

critical treatises. He reaches the result that Kant's fundamental distinction between the constitutive function of the categories and the regulative function of the ideas cannot be sustained. For it Dr. England would substitute the notion that categories and ideas are alike interpretative modes of thought which arise out of experience through man's determined effort to comprehend it. The result is to transform Kant's critical idealism into a critical realism, in which God appears as the Ground alike of the existence of the universe which is the object of our knowledge, and of its teleological evolution.

The new is emergent because the universe is dynamic and creative, and its dynamic, purposeful, and creative agency is deity . . . It is possible to conceive God as the sole ultimate individual whose self is confronted by a not-self which, though not external to him, is as real as the content presented to my processes of apprehension when these processes are directed to the events which go to the make-up of my own total personality.

Kant's Conception of God is undoubtedly a book to be seriously considered, but the kind of consideration it requires demands an intimate acquaintance with the details of Kantianism. Dr. England's conclusion is probably sound; but there are some knotty points involved in his arguments. His treatment of the categories especially needs a fresh examination. His view that they are not strictly *a priori* but rise out of experience threatens to destroy the whole Kantian fabric. Yet it is an important link in his chain of argument. By it he proves the categories to be interpretative only, and so reduces the gap between them and the ideas, which he is most urgently concerned to do.

Dr. Mackintosh's *The Christian Apprehension of God* takes us back from metaphysic to religion. It is here contended that while the possibility of a unified view of things must always be pre-supposed by the Christian theist, in practice he will do well to build his conception of God on the value-judgments of religion as these are applied to interpret the historical facts of the Old and New Testaments, especially the great crowning fact of Jesus. On the basis of these pre-suppositions Dr. Mackintosh unfolds the Christian conception of God as the personal Almighty Holy Love. Here he deals with arguments against the personality of God, and also explains in a way that interestingly reminds one of Father Stewart's Thomism, how the three attributes of holiness, love, and omnipotence present only aspects of the same Person, and are not to be understood as if they could ever be in conflict one with another.

Dr. Mackintosh's book is written not professedly for the theologian, but for the general reader. But it contains a synthesis of the best Protestant thought on its subject during the last century. While it is written with great learning behind it, the total result is admirably clear. Not only the general reader, but also the professed theologian cannot fail to gain from reading it.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Mind at the Crossways. By C. LLOYD MORGAN. Williams & Norgate. 10s. 6d.

In this book Dr. Lloyd Morgan carries a stage further the study of human nature which he began in his well-known works *Life, Man and Spirit* and *Emergent Evolution*. As may be gathered from the title, the volume before us is more psychological and is an attempt to construct a theory of mental activity on a purely naturalistic basis, while at the same time allowing for a certain originality and creative activity of the ego.

The book is a very real contribution to the study of the vexed problem of personality and should prove a welcome antidote to the blankly behaviourist attitude which certain modern psychologists have tried to popularize. Dr. Lloyd Morgan writes with his usual incisiveness and maintains his case against all comers. Some of his criticisms of writers from whom he differs are not the least interesting and valuable part of the book. As in his other books, he comes to a theistic conclusion in the end, though it is an agnostic type of theism. He says, "I believe in the existence of God independently of anyone's sentient gospels. But what He is in *Himself* apart from all references to Him on the part of reflective men and women I cannot say". This is an echo of a good deal that we find in modern writing on the subject of God, and it at least presents a challenge to Christian theology to build on even the slender foundation thus offered.

W. B. SELBIE.

Matter, Life and Value. By C. E. M. JOAD. Oxford Press. 18s.

Mr. Joad is a brilliant and copious writer (compare *Congregational Quarterly* for Jan., 1926, and for July, 1928). He continues to reject monism in every sense of the term. Yet he is willing to admit the possibility that life may be diffused through the whole of matter. Would not that be a true monism? It needs extraordinary confidence in the power of analytic thought to insist that life and matter, even if they should never exist apart, are two heterogeneous things. Again, Mr. Joad holds that evolution has been empirically "discovered". But what guarantee have we that a definite evolutionary trend will last five minutes longer in the sort of universe—rather, *multiverse*—in which we are asked to believe? More precisely, Mr. Joad's present system is neither dualism nor pluralism, but what they used to call in Austrian politics "trialism". The *Life-force* urges its way through the hindrance of *matter* in endless change; *Values*—like humbler "subsistent" truths—are eternally changeless, and constitute the only possible goal of evolution. So far as can be seen ahead, the end of the world-process is to be impersonal contemplation of the great Values by the Life-force, made wise through the age-long travail of humanity. There is to be no personal immortality. Our "subconsciousness"—only—will survive. About God, in this present year, Mr. Joad professes "inability to make any positive affirmation" (p. 392). The author's views on poetry, music, and mysticism are as fresh as the rest of his contentings, and perhaps not less perverse.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

The Theory of Christ's Ethics. By F. A. M. SPENCER, D.D. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Dr. Spencer continues his earlier studies in the same field. In *Civilization Remade by Christ* he developed the practical application of Christ's ethics to such subjects as war, money, politics, eugenics, marriage, and education. The present volume is an enquiry, theoretical in intention, into what it was that Christ did in fact teach. His recorded words are few, but, as Dr. Spencer says, His teaching did not cease at His death, and those who try to get His point of view by the study of His recorded sayings may thereby come into contact with His inspiration now.

We cannot follow Dr. Spencer through his enquiry in any detail. The work is thorough, and deals with all the more important questions involved in the subject, such as the interim-ethic; eschatology; Christ's attitude to the law, force, and persuasion; sin and reward and punishment. The chapters on moralizing the instincts and on the Pharisaic

complex are particularly interesting in their application of Christ's teaching to modern points of view. Dr. Spencer has a gift of discernment which enables him to express the imperishable teaching of Christ in the passing phrases of to-day. Perhaps, if we might criticize at all, we might say that there is a note of inevitable coldness in the book. The fire and emotion of the appeal of Jesus is rather quenched by the theoretical treatment. Our Lord's words appeal to faith, to the assent of the whole nature; the intellect, theorizing, cannot reproduce their persuasive power.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

Wealth and Life. By J. A. HOBSON. Macmillan. 15s.

The economic man, that human counter supposed to be predestined to wealth or poverty by the play of inexorable economic law, died long ago—if indeed he ever lived except as a fiction in the minds of the first writers on political economy. This book is an excellent example of the truer attitude of economists to their problem to-day. They see that wealth and life are related and interdependent. We cannot discuss the distribution of wealth without taking into consideration vital values, what men need in their lives. Man does not live by bread alone: he has a sense of value, and demands culture, leisure, and moral satisfaction. Spiritual needs are as much forces at work in the economic system as are the demands of the body. Needs create supply, and exchange, and all the traffic of the economic system; and, since some needs are spiritual, cultural, and intellectual, spirit and mind and the love of beauty are factors in the economic problem.

Humanitarianism and religion have also broken down the old economic theory. Mr. Hobson says, searchingly for us, that the old Puritan and Nonconformist stock supplied the energy, industry, and competitive enterprise which the industrial revolution required. The acquisition of wealth was regarded as a legitimate, nay, praiseworthy test of personal merit. But a low standard of living for the workers was accepted as a natural condition, the result of the operation of economic laws, established they thought, by God. But conscience, stimulated by Ruskin, Carlyle, and many others, has long since eaten away that belief, and to-day we regard the economic state not as the sphere where every man may get what he can, but as a creation whose function it is to provide for all according to their needs.

Mr. Hobson writes as a political economist conscious of the embarrassment which ethical considerations introduce into his science. But he deals with the resulting situation fully and fairly; first historically, showing the change which has come about; and afterwards, from that half-economic, half-ethical point of view, discussing current theories and suggested remedies, problems very interesting to us at this time—the right place for public control and private enterprise; motives, ambition, and public spirit; service or profit; the world-wide inter-relations of trade and finance; how far economic equality is possible, and other matters both instructive and corrective.

The book is timely and full of good matter frankly and quietly discussed. It is provided with an appropriate appendix containing questions and notes on each chapter, and might well be studied by groups.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

Stephen Hales, D.D., F.R.S. By A. E. CLARK-KENNEDY, M.D., M.R.C.P. Cambridge Press. 15s.

An account of the life of a man remarkable in many ways, not least in this, that in the first half of the eighteenth century he combined an arduous study of natural and physical science with the life of a devoted

clergyman of a suburban parish, and was never induced by the claims of the one to neglect the duties of the other, in an age when this was done by so many of his brethren with so much less reasonable an excuse.

He came early, when at Cambridge, in contact with Stukeley, the eminent scientist and antiquarian, and it was largely from him that Hales imbibed his taste for experiment; as what scientifically minded young man would not, under such circumstances as these? "We had," writes Stukeley, "an old Cat in the house, which had been a great Favorite of my Fathers and the whole Familys, and by my Mothers leave I rid her of the infirmitys of age, and made a handsom sceleton of her bones, which I carryd to Cambridge with me the next Journey thither" Pussy's last obsequies took place, for some unexplained reason, on the slopes of the Gogmagogs.

After leaving Cambridge, in 1709, Hales became perpetual Curate of Teddington, which cure he retained for the whole of his life, more than once refusing preferment. From that time on his life was a continuous investigation into natural and physical laws, beginning with studies of the circulation of the blood, the pressure of which he was the first to measure, by means of some ingenious and rather weird experiments. He discovered the nature, if not the exact composition, of carbon dioxide, and suggested the use, for the first time, of respirators. He devoted a great part of his life to fighting the gin traffic, and in their different ways Hales and Hogarth may be said to have had the chief hand in abolishing, or at least repressing, that terrible scourge.

Hales played a great part in founding the American colony of Georgia, and so incidentally became responsible for the sending out of Charles and John Wesley, to "convert the Negroes in the British Plantations to Christianity," an adventure which for the Wesleys turned out rather unfortunately.

Perhaps his principal success from a sociological point of view was his introduction of ventilators into slave-ships, ships of the line, gaols, etc., by which many thousands of lives must have been saved. A list of his lesser inventions fills a page, from which we learn that, *inter alia*, civilization owes to him the discovery of the inverted egg-cup in a pie, for preserving the juices thereof. And "though a man of a Baronet's family . . . he was found in his later years much busied in painting white with his own hands the top of the footpath posts, that his neighbours might not be injured by running against them in the dark."

Altogether a readable account of a man whose name should be better known than it is.

H. N. DIXON.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)

The Speaker's Bible, Mark, Vol. II (9s. 6d.) deals with the last seven chapters of the Gospel, and also contains an index to Vols. X-XVIII of the series. The volume contains the same features that we have noticed in previous volumes. Interpretation is drawn from all quarters, including some recent literature—witness Miss Padwick's *Temple Gairdner of Cuaro*, the Rev. A. D. Martin's *Aspects of the Way*, and the Rev. G. A. Buttrick's *The Parables of Jesus*.

Mr. Harry Kendall Booth, whose *Background of the Bible* was hailed as a useful production, has followed it up by *The Bridge between the*

Testaments (Scribners, 7s. 6d.), in which he surveys the life and literature from the time of Ezra to the Apostolic age. There are maps and tables showing the main events and the literature of the different periods, which Mr. Booth divides thus: Persian Rule (527-332); Greek Rule (372-320); Egyptian Rule (320-198); Syrian Rule (198-143); Independence (143-63); Roman Rule (63-37); Herodian Rule (37-44 A.D.). Scholars will disagree with Mr. Booth at this point and at that, but for the general reader who desires an acquaintance with the life and religious literature of the period the book is very serviceable.

All who delighted in Mr. John Oxenham's *The Hidden Years* will welcome *God's Candle* (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.), in which he surveys the Gospel narrative of the Crucifixion from the points of view of the Centurion, Judas, Barabbas, Simon of Cyrene, etc. The chapter on Barabbas is specially well done.

Mr. A. J. Farnsworth's *A Psalm that has made Heroes* (Sharp, 2s.) tells of historic occasions in which Ps. 46 figured.

Dr. T. R. Glover moves with the assured tread of a native about the highways and by-ways of ancient Greece and Rome, and he points out many things that we should miss as we go along. In *The Influence of Christ in the Ancient World* (Cambridge Press, 5s.) he sets out to answer the question, "What was it in Christ or in Christianity that beat down Venus and Jupiter, Isis and Osiris, Cybele and Mithras?". His answer is "because it squared best with the world's best intelligence, because essentially it liberated the human mind", because, in short, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty". We are not sure that, pleasant as the lectures are, they are quite conclusive: suggestive, rather, and sometimes severe, as on Mr. R. T. Herford. The eulogy of Tertullian pleased us.

Two books follow which deal with the period covered by Dr. Glover, and in some degree with the same subject—Prof. S. Angus's *The Religious Quests of the Græco-Roman World* (Murray, 15s.—a cheap price for such a book) and Prof. H. R. Willoughby's *Pagan Regeneration* (Chicago Univ. Press, 13s. 6d.). Both are books which must be mastered by those who would gain a right understanding of early Christianity by first obtaining a proper idea of its milieu. Dr. Angus's *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* immediately took rank as an authority, and he has now developed the same theme. Was there a pagan, as well as a Jewish, preparation for Christianity? What were the religious ideas and practices of the century into which Christianity came? Dr. Angus sets himself to answer these questions; he faces again the problems of the relation of Christianity to the Mystery Religions, and of the place and meaning of sacraments—here turning aside to discuss the function of sacraments to-day. Then he discusses astrology, hermeticism, and gnosticism, concluding with an examination of religion as a therapeutic in the Græco-Roman days.

Prof. Willoughby's field is narrower, but his treatment is quite as thorough. His task is to investigate mystery initiations as a prolegomenon to a study of the mystical experience of Paul. Having examined the causes for the popularity of the Mystery cults, he endeavours to find the significance of the initiation rites. Popularity and initiation are bound up together, for initiation secures the gifts that make the cult popular—new birth, new life in mystical experience, and salvation

¹ We follow Mr. Booth's dates.

through an alliance with the lord of the cult which robs the unknown spiritual world of its terrors and gives the assurance of happy immortality.

We like the frank earnestness and the wholesome simplicity of the Rev. Francis Underhill's *Prayer in Modern Life* (Mowbray, 5s.), and we trust that many will be led by it to discover that reasonableness in prayer that the book urges.

The lurid cover and title of the Rev. Percy Dearmer's *The Legend of Hell* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) suggest something sensational rather than a scholarly treatise. Dr. Dearmer outlines the history of the belief in eternal punishment, and then examines the New Testament evidence for it.

Another Anglican dignitary, the Dean of Chester, takes quite another line in *The Resurrection of the Dead* (Chapman & Hall, 5s.). He feels no difficulty at all about the Athanasian Creed, and finds natural immortality or universalism repugnant and entirely unscriptural. It is a common error to think of human immortality apart from the resurrection of Jesus: human immortality is possible only where goodness is. This belief in conditional immortality is, the Dean believes, in accord with the teaching both of Jesus and of modern science. A suggestive book, rather overloaded with quotations, which makes one marvel how it is possible to write on conditional immortality and not mention Edward White.

We strongly recommend the Rev. H. W. Fox's **The Child's Approach to Religion* (Williams & Norgate, 3s. 6d.), not only to parents, but to all who have dealings with young people. It is one of the best books that we have seen for showing how Christianity can be taught in such a way that there will be nothing to unlearn in future years. The words of the Bishop of Liverpool's Introduction are altogether justified:—"I know of no book which sets forth so clearly and attractively a course of Christian teaching, definite and sympathetic. I know of many parents, including myself, who need and want exactly what it offers, and I think I can promise that it will help them to teach not only their children but themselves."

Dr. George Stewart's *Can I Teach My Child Religion?* (S.C.M., 3s.) deals with a similar problem, but not, we think, so successfully. Dr. Stewart's approach is psychological, and only a part of his book is devoted to the subject suggested in the title. The best things in it are the insistence on the effect of a parent's own behaviour on a child, and the book list in the last chapter.

With Mr. Fox's book we put Dr. Alington's **Doubts and Difficulties* (Longmans, 5s. and 3s. 6d.), in which the Headmaster of Eton accepts the challenge to write an apologetic for Christianity in non-technical terms. The result is excellent, and we hope that young people in all the churches will read the book. Partly in the form of a dialogue with husband and wife, partly in letters to the wife, Dr. Alington manages to bring out in an extremely attractive way the centralities of the Christian faith. He never shirks the problems nor loses himself in a cloud of words. It is encouraging to think that the youth of Eton are in such sane and sensible hands.

It is not easy to see how Mr. J. H. Tuckwell's *The Faith of the Future* (Methuen, 5s.) fits into Dr. Jacks's "The Faiths" series. It is a strange book, at once naïve and provocative. Christianity, Mr. Tuckwell holds, did not originate with Jesus in His earthly life, but is a Mystery cult which had its birth on Græco-Roman soil.

It is a continuation, in some respects at a higher level, of the Mystery cults which it was ultimately successful in displacing. It is an interim religion, holding a place in the minds of the still undeveloped masses of humanity, but itself destined to pass away at such time as reason comes to its maturity, and humanity discovers at length that what it has been seeking to obtain from without already exists implicitly within, waiting exfoliation.

("Exfoliate", by the way, is Mr. Tuckwell's pet word: we are always meeting it). The only alternative religions in the future are "Reason and Rome", and Mr. Tuckwell finds the religion of reason in the New Thought of America, a higher pantheism which will be the religion of the future, people then having discovered that it is not necessary to be a Christian to be religious. The words of Euripides, "Reason in each one of us is God", may be said to be the motto of the faith of the future, and Mr. Tuckwell shows how Catholicism and Unitarianism will relate themselves to it. For the churches between he has little sympathy and little hope—and, we think, little understanding.

The conception of Mr. C. W. Ferguson's *The Confusion of Tongues* (Heinemann, 12s. 6d.) is so admirable that we cannot help regretting that the working-out falls so much below the possibility. "A review of modern 'isms'", summarizing the history and the tenets of the leading cults that make so much stir in the America of to-day could have been extremely useful. And up to a point it is, for Mr. Ferguson has an observant eye and a lucid style. But he is often flippant, and there is an atmosphere about the sketches that is displeasing, for there are many sincere people even in the most frothy of the "isms"—even among the followers of Aimée Semple Macpherson, the Unity School, and the 4A (the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism). We do not know whether Mr. Ferguson is responsible for the jacket, but it illustrates the book's main weaknesses. It reads, "Some Sure Ways to be Saved":

Deny death, evil, sin, disease.	- - - -	Christian Science.
Choose likely parents for your next embodiment.		Theosophy.
Help build a cathedral of thought-gelatin.		Liberal Catholics.
Breathe properly, and concentrate on the solar plexus.		Swamis & Yogis.
Talk with the spirits of the great.	- - -	Spiritualism.
Confess in detail and obtain like confessions.	-	Buchmanism.

The book aggravates, too, by the frequency of its slips and misprints—we have noticed them on pp. 15, 29, 69, 75, 145, 217, 247, 284, 322 (two in consecutive lines), 389, 433. American printers can do better than this.

The Rev. P. B. Clayton's **Plain Tales from Flanders* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) is an antidote to some of the sordid and squalid war books that have recently been the rage. It tells of bravery and sacrifice, and of the presence and the following of Christ mid shot, shell, wounds, and death. Mr. Clayton's are the sort of sketches that all men who are enabled by other men's sacrifice to share in the building of a new world should read many a time and oft—so easily do we forget that our lives are mortgaged up to the hilt.

Seeing that his output is so regular, the Rev. F. W. Boreham keeps it up amazingly well. Anything can start him off—the memory of a clock-work mouse given him one Christmas, the Ibsen centenary, a climb to an eagle's nest. This time the result is *The Three Half-Moons* (Epworth Press, 5s.). Mr. Boreham must be as hard put to it to find titles as were the parents of an old-time family of twenty to find names.

Right down to the end, W. L. Watkinson made sermons when he could not preach them, and *The Stability of the Spiritual* (Sharp, 3s. 6d.) contains eleven characteristic sermons written in the last months of his life. There is an appreciation by the Rev. G. Beesley Austin.

From The Tops of the Hills (Sharp, 5s.) is a memorial volume to the late Arthur Hoyle. It consists of papers written for the *Methodist Recorder* during a long period of years—lively papers by one who was in touch with the throbbing life of large communities. It would have been to the advantage of the book had a brief memoir been prefixed, and each essay dated.

Many who do not know the Rev. Harold E. Brierley will welcome anything he writes for the sake of the name he bears: there are still hundreds of people up and down the country, and not ministers only, who remember the debt that they owe to "J.B.". But the "Sermons on the Things that Matter Most" which Mr. Brierley prints in *Life Indeed* (Clark, 7s.) are worth reading for their own sake. Mr. Brierley has not his father's range of illustration, but he has the courage of his convictions.

He is a bold man who would survey *Religion in Human Affairs* (Chapman & Hall, 17s. 6d.) from its unknown beginning down to—well, not merely the present, for the last chapter is "Faith and Philosophy of the Future". Dr. Clifford Kilpatrick, of the University of Pennsylvania, has attempted the task, and he shows himself to have read both widely and wisely in preparation for it.

We do not think the book is altogether well proportioned: a good deal of space is given to origins and to magic, and perhaps not enough to the part religion has played in the ordinary everyday life of the individual. There are, too, abundant evidences throughout that the book is of American origin. The diagram is a good deal in evidence: we have, e.g., a diagram reproducing Giddings's "Distribution of Personality Types by Sects"—the types being idio-motor, idio-emotional, dogmatic-emotional, and critical-intellectual. No "sect" reaches the last classification, but Congregationalism, with others, comes between 3 and 4.

A full and suggestive book, with a long, selected bibliography.

Next we have a group of books on the history of the Church.

All Dr. Carnegie Simpson writes is workmanlike and scholarly, and *The Church and the State* (Clarke, 6s.) is extremely serviceable at the present time. It surveys—omitting the Orthodox Church—the relations of Church and State during the nineteen centuries of Christian history. A book to keep at hand for reference.

The Rev. C. P. S. Clarke's *Short History of the Christian Church* (Longmans, 10s. 6d.) must have entailed a good deal of work. Within limits it is extremely useful, but what those limits are it is easy to see when the book is put side by side with Williston Walker's *History of the Christian Church*, where one is always conscious of judicial impartiality and of the authority that springs from first-hand knowledge of sources.

When contact between the Orthodox Church and Western Christendom is being restored it is useful to have an authoritative account of the Church's doctrine, polity, worship, and history. That has been provided in Mr. D. A. Lowrie's translation of Dr. Stefan Zankov's *The Eastern Orthodox Church* (S.C.M., 5s.), six lectures delivered in Berlin and published under the title, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum des Ostens*.

In 180 pp. the Bishop of Chichester's *A Brief Sketch of the Church of England* (S.C.M., 4s. and 2s. 6d.) summarizes the history, worship,

organization, and outlook of the Church of England, and gives an account of its relation with other Churches.

Dr. C. S. Phillips's *The Church in France, 1789-1848* (Mowbray, 15s.) is a readable volume which fills a gap for the English reader. We know no book in English which deals so succinctly with the French Church in and subsequent to the Revolution period.

Thirteen Methodists from the three uniting denominations describe in *Methodism and the Modern World* (Sharp, 6s.) the history, the message, and the mission of Methodism. The volume is edited by Dr. Scott Lidgett and the Rev. B. H. Reed.

It would almost be easier to make a list of the subjects on which Mr. Kenneth Ingram's *Has the Church Failed?* (Allan, 5s.) does not touch than of those it includes. There are penetrating sections in it, but the easy assurance with which he writes is evidently in some places the assurance of ignorance. He certainly does not know that "had the reforms of Erasmus prevailed, and had Luther not existed, the world would be a much happier and better place to-day", and he would be hard put to it to prove that "Dances are organized by the strictest Baptists in aid of chapel funds". Our readers will be glad to learn that, according to this Anglo-Catholic, "Nonconformist sermons are usually intelligent reviews of social and moral problems, and sometimes they reveal a considerable intellectual merit". Despite some good things the book cannot be considered a serious contribution.

The Rev. R. Pyke's *The Protestant Faith and Challenge* (Sharp, 3s. 6d.) does not pretend to be more than a survey of the Reformation and of Reformation doctrine for an ordinary congregation. But even then it should have mentioned Calvin!

The Reunion of Christendom (Cassell, 7s. 6d.) is a survey of the present position by writers representing various Churches. Cardinal Bourne and Archbishop Germanos write for the Roman and Eastern Churches; the Free Church contributors are Dr. Garvie and Dr. Scott Lidgett; there is no Baptist; and Dr. Orchard concludes with "A Vision of the Reunited Church".

The Rt. Hon. H. A. L. Fisher has enjoyed writing *Our New Religion* (Benn, 6s.) and we have enjoyed reading it. The book is a study of Christian Science, and Mr. Fisher makes full use of the ample opportunity for irony that Christian Science and its founder present. His three chapters deal with "The Prophetess", "The Creed", and "The Church", and together they form an adequate—and, we think, a fair—picture of Christian Science. Mr. Fisher thinks that Christian Science is too soundly entrenched, both as a financial corporation and in its ability to take credit for healings, to follow countless other American sects into speedy oblivion: the only thing that could destroy it would be to show effectively that it is not Christian.

A new series, published under the auspices of the English Church Union, is the "Anglican Library of Faith and Thought" (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.). The Editor is the Rev. L. Prestige, and the first three volumes are the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare's *Problems of Providence* (a thoughtful piece of apologetic), the Rev. A. Chandler's *Christian Religious Experience*, and Canon T. A. Lacey's *The Reformation and the People* (sound, but taking no cognizance of much recent work).

Sisyphus (Kegan Paul, 2s. 6d.) is a fascinating little essay on "the future of psychology", in which Mr. M. Jaeger is specially concerned

with behaviourism. Having decided "that this cussed human nature of ours is singularly unamenable to the scientific method", he concludes thus: "Science has, in general, the air of becoming less and less nearly exact as it mounts higher. When it reaches man's higher faculties, there may be found to be a debatable ground where intellect gradually gives place to action as the only available means to understanding".

From the future of psychology we turn back to *The History of Psychology* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.), which Dr. W. B. Pillsbury has related in 320 pp., beginning with the Egyptians and the Greeks, and ending with the Gestalt and Understanding Schools. The pages dealing with modern psychology are very useful for reference, and the photographs are interesting—we have J. B. Watson, Freud, Adler, and Köhler on one page.

Sir James Jeans's little book *Eos* had prepared us for a treat in *The Universe Around Us* (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.), and we have not been disappointed. It is but rarely that the reading of a book challenges us to sit down to work, notebook in hand, until we have absolutely mastered its contents, but that is the feeling we have at present. Bewildered, of course, by the magnitude of the universe revealed to us, thrilled by its beauty, and impressed and awed by its laws, we are also moved by man's achievements in discovering so much about it in the brief span of human life. Sir James has apt illustration at his command, and his analogies prove very useful: he writes well and those prepared to use their brains need not fear to tackle the book. They will have all manner of thrills. Having begun to shiver with fright at the discovery that the sun is, so to speak, on the edge of a precipice and liable to shrink into a "white-dwarf" star, they will suddenly be re-assured to learn that the 3 per cent. decrease in luminosity which means falling over the precipice cannot take less than 150 million years, while it is unlikely that the actual fall will occur in under a million million years. The earth's temperature will then be 30 deg. C. lower, the mountains will have become plains, and the seas and rivers ice: life will be routine rather than adventure, for the human race will be doomed to extinction. But wait! Venus will then have cooled sufficiently to entertain mankind, and—though Sir James Jeans does not say this—by that time there should be a big Celestial Furniture Removing Trust at work.

Mr. J. D. Bernal's *The World, The Flesh and the Devil* (Routledge, 2s. 6d.) discusses the possibility of the future in the light of the three "enemies of the rational soul". He envisages a state in which man has colonized space and mechanized the body, having extended consciousness by attaching new nerve-centres to his brain: the sublimation of sex will have developed so that a part will go to research, and a larger part to æsthetic creation. As remote as it is entertaining.

It is a pity that a person of the standing and intelligence of Mr. Bertrand Russell should so frequently stoop to gibes and sneers in his published works. A little of the cool detachment of the mathematical philosophy would be very welcome when Mr. Russell is dealing with difficult social questions. Very often he goes far out of his way to make offensive remarks. What, for example, has this to do with *Marriage and Morals* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.)?

The Pelaw Islanders believe that the perforation of the nose is necessary for winning eternal bliss. Europeans think that this end is better attained by wetting the head while pronouncing certain words. The belief of the Pelaw Islanders is a superstition; the belief of the Europeans is one of the truths of our holy religion.

This, of course, quite ignores the fact that millions of Europeans do not believe in baptismal regeneration; but in any case Mr. Russell's reference is of the lowest Hyde Park orator type.

Mr. Russell never hesitates to drag in an attack on Christianity, of which he knows next to nothing, while he makes no attempt at all to be fair. When we remember how Jesus joined together love for God and love for neighbour, what are we to make of statements like, "In the ethic of Christianity, it is the relation of the soul to God that is important, not the relation of man to his fellow men"?

Mr. Russell's book is a plea for greater freedom in sex relations. He writes as a strong supporter of companionate marriage and would dissociate the elements of procreation and pleasure that enter into the sexual relationship. But no matter how clever a man might be, a discussion of this kind cannot be usefully conducted in a spirit of sneering cynicism.

That having been said, it ought to be said, too, that the Churches are failing to face the new situation in regard to sexual questions. The new freedom of women, the surplus number of women, and the widespread knowledge of contraceptives have given the problem an entirely new aspect. Thousands of ministers and deacons would have the shock of their lives if they knew the way in which their young people regarded (in theory and in practice) old sexual standards and conventions.

**Birth Control and Human Integrity* (Independent Press, 1s. 6d.), by the Master of Balliol and Mrs. Lindsay, is a timely little book. It is a plea for a sense of responsibility in regard to sex relations, and especially in those engaged in birth control propaganda. The use of contraceptives is being indiscriminately urged long before even the medical profession is prepared to speak with confidence about its physical and psychical results, and it is doing great harm among married and unmarried alike. Dr. and Mrs. Lindsay ask that supporters of the propaganda should be clear in their aims and objects, should avoid hasty publicity and consequent over-emphasis, should discover and state the disadvantages as well as the advantages of the methods advocated, and should "realize the immediate necessity of getting regulations passed with regard to the advertisement, display, and sale of contraceptives". We hope ministers will make a point of reading this book: it will help them greatly in the most difficult pastoral problem of to-day.

To balance it they might turn to Dr. Marie C. Stopes's *Mother England* (Bale, Danielsson, 10s. 6d.), though we do not recommend anybody to read this book who has not a strong stomach. It is described as "A Contemporary History, Self-written by those who have had no historian." Apparently, writing in *John Bull*, Dr. Stopes invited correspondence: here she prints samples of letters received during 1926 by those who sought her advice. How far one is justified in printing intimate letters of this kind, even without names, is doubtful. They are infinitely pathetic and sometimes heartrending. Often crude and badly spelt, they are in many cases from poor women with large families in crowded rooms, often too by those who have been warned that child-birth will mean probable loss of life. Here we see plainly the indignation of the poor at the withholding of knowledge obtainable by the rich, and at the refusal of the medical profession to advise them how to prevent conception.

A book like this is, without doubt, very effective propaganda for some form of education in sexual hygiene. Those doubtful about instruction in methods of birth control will probably claim that the writers of these letters are abnormal cases which should receive definite medical guidance. Dr.

Stopes would reply that they are typical cases, and that in three months she has received no less than 20,000 requests for advice as to how to procure criminal abortion, the widespread nature of which practice, she holds, is producing disastrous results in maternal mortality and in female health generally.

The whole subject bristles with difficulties. There is no doubt that the indiscriminate advocacy of contraceptives has done much harm, and yet Dr. Stopes's book presents a terrible picture. There is great need for the sense of responsibility urged by Dr. and Mrs. Lindsay, and for a thorough analysis of all the data obtainable about the results of the use of contraceptives. We cannot refrain from saying that the medical profession has been greatly to blame for shirking this problem. On every hand people troubled in mind seem to have sought medical counsel in vain.

Mrs. Soltau's *The Free Woman* (S.C.M., 6s.) bears the cumbersome subtitle, "Some Inferences from the Thoughts of Jesus Christ in Relation to Problems of Personality and Womanhood". Mrs. Soltau is right in holding that while in Christ woman should find perfect freedom, yet the Church has not merely kept woman in subjection in the past, but even yet does little to secure her full liberty. Mrs. Soltau shows how modern life still puts upon women an unfair share of the burden, and asks how woman's desire for independent work is to be met. A thoughtful book full of commonsense.

The Religious Basis of World Peace (Williams & Norgate, 6s.—a stiff price) contains the addresses delivered at a Conference convened at Prague in August, 1928, by the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship Through the Churches. There are twelve addresses by men of different nationalities and religious affiliation.

Dr. R. H. Murray is one of the most industrious scholars of our time, and his labours are generally directed to most useful ends. Many students, within the Universities and without, will be grateful for his *Studies in the English Social and Political Thinkers of the Nineteenth Century* (Heffer, 2 vols., 12s. 6d. each), Vol. I of which covers the ground from Malthus to Kingsley, Vol. II from Spencer to the present Prime Minister. No more can be done in this review than to give a list of names, merely stating that Dr. Murray gives apt commentary on each and a list of books for reference. We have Malthus, Bentham, Mill, Owen, Coleridge, Disraeli, a glimpse at the Church as seen in the Oxford Movement and the Disruption in Scotland, Carlyle, Cobden, J. S. Mill, and Kingsley in Vol. I, Spencer, Maine, Ruskin, Matthew Arnold, Bagehot, Green, Bryce, Maitland, and "Socialism" in Vol. II.

Professor Ramsay Muir's *British History* (Philip, 7s. 6d.) is a truly remarkable achievement—and from two points of view: it is a marvel of compression, summarizing the history of the British peoples (not merely the history of England) from the earliest times to 1929; and it is eminently fair and impartial, even in its account of recent English politics, in which Mr. Ramsay Muir has himself had a part. The book, though an entirely new work, is in some sense an abridgment of the *Short History of the British Commonwealth*. Our only criticism is in regard to the rather summary treatment of the years preceding 1485, though perhaps this was unavoidable when stress was to be laid on post-Colonial days.

Sir Alexander Cardew's *The White Mutiny* (Constable, 12s. 6d.) has two objects—to "rescue from oblivion" the story of the mutiny of British

officers in India in 1809, and to do justice to Sir George Barlow, the Governor, by whose firmness and courage, Sir Alexander believes, the situation was saved. The result is a piece of historical research which certainly wins our sympathies for Barlow and at the same time makes scenes of a century ago live vividly before us.

Dr. Wm. Law Mathieson has already written on *British Slavery and Its Abolition*, dealing with the story as far as the year 1838. In *Great Britain and The Slave Trade, 1839-1865* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.) he resumes the narrative, prefixing an Introduction which summarizes the state of affairs between 1807 and 1833. Dr. Mathieson writes well, and brings out both the horrors of the trade and the varied endeavours made to continue it—and also the unremitting efforts of many in this country to suppress it. We are reminded once again of Lecky's dictum: "The unweary, unostentatious and inglorious crusade of England against slavery may probably be regarded as among the three or four virtuous pages comprised in the history of nations".

We wish all towns were fortunate enough to have a chronicler like Mr. Reginald L. Hine, the second volume (Allen & Unwin, 16s.) of whose *History of Hitchin* has now appeared. This volume deals fully and well with the history of Nonconformity in the town, and completes a work of which the author has every reason to be proud.

Mr. F. J. Gould's *The Pioneers of Johnson's Court* (Watts, 2s. 6d.) is an illustrated dictionary of "Rationalist" biography. It is useful in that it gives the facts about persons prominent in the work of the R.P.A. since its foundation in 1899, but it is disfigured by cheap allusions and by extravagant claims like that on p. 50, where we are told to thank the Agnostic for the freedom of women on "the sunny tennis-courts of 1929". A list of legacies shows that the R.P.A. has received nearly £40,000 through this channel.

Most readers of these pages could compile a more striking list of quotations to show the change "which has come over the minds of the educated clergy" than Mr. C. T. Gorham's *A Note-book for Christians* (Watts, 2s. 6d.), a very tame collection mainly from the writings of "Modern Churchmen".

Vol. IV of *The Diary of a Country Parson* (Oxford Press, 12s. 6d.) brings our old friend, James Woodforde, before us once more. The volume covers the years 1793-1796, and the diary is to be completed in the next volume. The entries have the same characteristics as those in previous years—menus of meals (some of them of considerable length) being general, and comments on the dishes common:

November 10, 1794. . . Dinner to-day—Bullocks Heart boiled (according to Dr. Thornes recommendation) and a Pheasant roasted. N.B., a Bullock's Heart boiled is a Bullock's Heart spoiled. We think a roast one far preferable . . . The Pheasant though a Hen was very hard. It must be a very old one.

Visits to his family in the West Country are again described. Who would not like to be "put down at the White Hart in Stall Street kept by Pickwick and Wife and there we supped and slept, and a very excellent House it is, everything so good and neat, etc."?

There are references to the French Revolution and the War, and its effect is seen in the rising prices. Woodforde, however, seems more concerned with his health than with politics, and we hear much about his interior, his gout, and a troublesome "anicle".

The country clergyman of the eighteenth century, if Woodforde be a type, seems to have spent most of his time visiting, eating, and attending to his land and stock. There is little sign of reading, though Woodforde does pay a small bill for books in Norwich occasionally: probably these books were similar to the pamphlet lent him by his curate, "Count Rumford's Essay on smoaking Chimnies, and how to be perfectly cured".

We have spent a pleasant hour with Dr. F. W. Hilles's *Letters of Sir Joshua Reynolds* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.), which is more than we can say about some other Ph.D. theses. Dr. Hilles has collected from various sources 160 letters, 42 of which have not been previously published. They are ably documented, and give a pleasing picture of the great man, though they contain little or nothing that is new.

Mr. Norman H. Baynes's *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) is a model piece of work of its kind. The bibliography will naturally appeal only to specialists, but many who have used Bury's works and tried to attend his lectures will read the memoir with great interest. Whether we think first of Bury as a philosopher of history, as a "researcher", or as a vigorous protagonist for "freedom of thought", as the "rationalist" conceives it, we are obliged to recognize in him a remarkable combination of qualities.

It is safe to say that no man but Mr. Baynes could have written the memoir. He is one of few competent to estimate the value of Bury's Byzantine work, and his discussion of Bury's view of history is both good and fair, while he does not overlook the weaknesses of Bury's outlook and method—his lack of the sense of proportion, and his failure to give ecclesiastical history its due place. Altogether a piece of work for which historians can be grateful.

It has often been said that Roman Catholicism is kept alive and powerful by the saints it grows. Mr. W. E. Brown conceived the idea of describing the lives of such saints. The first five he selects—Ambrose, Martin, Wilfrid, Boniface, and Dunstan—all turn out to be *Bishops* (Sands, 3s. 6d.), under which title the book is published.

In the "Saints" series (Burns, Oates, 3s. 6d.) we welcome a translation, by Mr. J. L. Stoddard, of Mgr. Pierre Batiffol's *Saint Gregory the Great*, duly authorized for Roman Catholic reading.

Miss Gollock's "biographical study", *Eugene Stock* (C.M.S., 3s. 6d.), will be greatly appreciated by all interested in the vast enterprise of foreign missions. Stock lived to be ninety-two, and for a quarter of a century after his retirement from the Editorial Secretaryship of the C.M.S. continued to exercise a wide influence, not merely on the work of his own Society, but on missionary work in general. The Church of England was fortunate indeed in having a layman of his conspicuous gifts to serve it in a responsible post through a difficult period.

Although Dr. G. F. Barbour quotes words spoken of Henry Drummond, that one cannot "write the history of a fragrance", yet his memoir of *Katherine Scott* (Blackwood, 3s. 6d.) is a beautiful tribute to a saintly life. Born in 1884, the daughter of Lord Polwarth, Katherine Scott worked as Woman Patrol in Hawick in the early years of the war. Afterwards she became one of the Social Work Secretaries of the Church of Scotland and Police Court Sister and Probation Officer. It was in this last capacity that Katherine Scott did her best work, described in her own sketches printed in this little volume. She died in 1928, and Dr. Norman

Maclean's words express what her friends felt and what readers of this memoir must feel with them :

She worked with all her strength and with all her love to reclaim the lost. In every girl and woman she saw a sister in Christ, and gave them all a sister's love. She had the secret which alone makes it possible to save—she gave herself. The world is poorer because she is gone . . . We do not praise her; she would not like to be praised. We only humbly ask God that we may be inspired to follow in her footsteps.

If you are a serious person and easily annoyed, you had better not read Mr. Martin Shaw's *Up to Now* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). But if you are not too critical, and not easily put off by references to people which sometimes seemed to be dragged in after the manner of a column of society gossip, and if you want to while away an hour, you will enjoy this ambling narrative. Mr. Martin Shaw's life story will not please the Samuel Smiles type, but it has much of the vitality and freshness, as well as much of the jerkiness and superficiality, that seem characteristic of modern youth. It contains some very good stories.

Sir Arthur Yapp's *The Adventure of Youth* (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.) is a twentieth century Samuel Smiles. It consists of twenty-seven papers, each of which puts before modern youth adventure in some sphere of thought or action, with the Y.M.C.A., of course, specially emphasized.

We cannot essay with pleasure the easy task of criticizing the late Bramwell Booth's *These Fifty Years* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.), "reminiscences of Army work and warfare, prior to 1912". There are some good things in it, but perhaps the most intriguing is Bramwell Booth's criticism of Marie Corelli's *The Treasure of Heaven* as "marred by overmuch sentimentalism"!

In *An Eskimo Village* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) Dr. S. K. Hutton describes his work on the Labrador Coast. It is a moving account of missionary activity.

Mr. Hugh Kingsmill's *After Puritanism* (Duckworth, 8s. 6d.) is a very clever and intensely interesting, if sometimes unpleasant, book. It is an examination of the "disintegration of Puritanism" between the years 1850 and 1890, and consists of studies of Dean Farrar, Samuel Butler, Frank Harris, and W. T. Stead. All four are well done, though there is a cynicism about it all, specially evident in the sketch of Stead, which jars on the reader. There is something on nearly every page which starts thought or incites contradiction, though at times Mr. Kingsmill is in danger of degenerating into the merely smart—as when the heading of an *Evening News* article, "Awful Death in a Brewery", is dragged in to say that Mr. G. K. Chesterton would consider this "a contradiction in terms".

Readers who remember General A. W. Greely's article in our pages describing part of his own polar expedition will welcome his *Polar Regions in the Twentieth Century* (Harrap, 12s. 6d.). This useful account of Polar Exploration is the work of a magnificent octogenarian who fought through the American Civil War, and was the first American private to become a general, and who endured great hardships during his expedition, now nearly fifty years ago. The book deals more with the North Pole than with the South, and naturally gives a disproportionate space to those years of which the author can say *quorum magna pars fui*, but nevertheless it is a valuable record. A reviewer who has visited General Greely in

his summer home in the White Mountains, and heard some of these experiences from his own lips, cannot but give a special welcome to the book.

"Let me not live until my flame lacks oil,
To be the snuff of younger spirits."

We could not keep these words out of our minds as we turned the pages of Georges Clemenceau's *In the Evening of my Thought* (Constable, 2 vols., 30s.). The book itself cannot be described in better words than the author's:

"I am eighty-six years old and I am nearing the end. I approach the portals of death and I see before me the Angel Gabriel with his trumpet. He says to me, 'Have you anything to say before you pass these portals?' And I turn to him and reply, 'I should think I had something to say, and I say it here in this book.'"

The Angel Gabriel would evidently be kept waiting for some time, for these volumes contain over 1,000 pp. He would hear—or will be hearing—about "The World and Man", "Men and Gods", "Gods and Laws", "Dreaming and Thinking", "Knowing", "Symbols", "Cosmogonies: Revelation, Song, Poetry, Metaphysics", "Cosmology", "The Atom", "Our Planet", "Evolution", "The Primitive Ages", "Civilization", "And Hereafter?". And no doubt at the end Clemenceau will have forced the gates, for he has generally managed to get his own way. This final "word" of his is a characteristic *tour de force*, a typical conclusion to a life that has been packed full with labour and enterprise.

Miss Ellen Chase's *Tenant Friends in Old Deptford* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.) takes us back forty years, for it tells of Miss Chase's experiences as one of Miss Octavia Hill's collectors between 1886 and 1891. The book was written in the main before Miss Hill's death, but has only now been completed for publication. It gives an excellent account of the work of the collectors, and some of the chapters are extremely well done—that on Mrs. Singleton being a conspicuous example. Canon Barnett's name is misspelled on p. 210.

It is extremely valuable to have the first-hand observations of a British traveller in India. Mr. H. G. Alexander, a Quaker bird-lover, with a special concern about opium, visited India in 1928; living largely with Indians, he believes that he has learned far more about the Indian character in three months than many Englishmen learn in thirty years. He saw Gandhi and Tagore, and C. F. Andrews writes an Introduction to his narrative, which he calls *The Indian Ferment* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.). Mr. Alexander was told by Gandhi, "first, we want you to get off our backs", and he has been confirmed in his opinion that Britain has only two alternatives, to rule by the sword, or to withdraw and yield full responsibility to India. His journeyings reveal how this opinion was forced upon him time after time. It is a pity that the book is disfigured by violent onslaughts on Miss Mayo (and by "Calcutta" on p. 88) for it should render good service. It ends with asking whether Britain to-day possesses a Campbell-Bannerman.

Another book on India is Mr. Edwyn Bevan's *Thoughts on Indian Discontents* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.). It is both gratifying and heartening to find a scholar of Mr. Bevan's standing and reputation addressing himself again to one of the most critical political problems of the day. His book is marked by knowledge, sympathy, and vision, and cannot but do good both here and in India. He is deeply conscious of the serious nature of the Indian situation:

"Unfortunately, it by no means follows, when two bodies of men are moving to a collision, that because the more clear-sighted on each side see that the collision would be a catastrophe for both, which reasonableness could easily avoid, the catastrophe will therefore be avoided."

He does not feel that we can leave India, nor can he believe in Dominion Home Rule, for that means leaving India if India is to be on the same footing as Canada. He urges that the weakness of the people is the cause of foreign government, and that therefore the urgent need is to make the people strong—physically, economically, intellectually—and able to express an effective public opinion. If in these ways India can develop a forward-looking Nationalism to displace the backward-looking Nationalism which has been its bane in the past, it should grow a nation to which control could ultimately be surrendered. British officials could help greatly by adding friendliness to the high sense of duty that is now characteristic of them.

A wise and timely book, with, strange to say, the chapter on religion as its weakest chapter.

No one has done more than Mr. C. F. Andrews to interpret, and indeed to reconcile, India and Britain to each other. His new book, *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) is another step in this work of mutual interpretation. It is the first of two volumes, the one to come being Gandhi's autobiography. The present volume perhaps contains nothing new to those who see *Young India* and have kept in touch with Gandhi's life and witness, but it is useful to have collected in this way Gandhi's views on religion and politics, and on the problems in which they find expression—*swadeshi*, *khaddar*, untouchability, and the rest. Mr. Andrews has been in the closest touch with Gandhi for many years, in South Africa as well as India, and he speaks with peculiar authority, indicating the correct interpretation of Gandhi's views at all the critical stages in his career.

No Christian can read these pages without a profound feeling of shame that the lives of Christians have often been so divorced from their beliefs as to keep "seekers" away from Christ.

Mr. C. Delisle Burns's *Democracy, Its Defects and Advantages* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) is worth both reading and keeping for reference. Mr. Burns writes as a believer in the common man, and in the part he can and ought to play in the life of the world. He has things to say that go home: "It is childish for the superior person to condemn the dustman for his lack of culture, so long as this superior person does not remove his own refuse". The chapter on "The Spiritual Power" has similar things to say to the Church, which "as a social unit either has no mind at all or no power to express it". But Mr. Burns is scarcely fair to the Church. The Free Churches, for example, have often witnessed bravely for social justice, and there is probably more liberty of prophesying in the churches to-day than in, say, the Labour Party—as Mr. Maxton would be prepared to agree.

Mr. Mark Starr's *Lies and Hate in Education* (Hogarth Press, 5s.) is one of those books that make us pray to be saved from our friends. There is good work to be done in purifying history textbooks and in showing the menace of nationalism and party spirit in education (on the lines of Mr. J. F. Scott's book reviewed a short time ago), but the temper of Mr. Starr's contribution is such that the remedy is quite as bad as the disease.

What is rationalization? How many times has not that question been asked during the last two years? There is now no excuse for ignorance, for Mr. L. Urwick, the Director of the International Management Institution at Geneva, has clearly answered the question in *The Meaning of Rationalization* (Nisbet, 7s. 6d.), which explains the history of the movement and its practical utility.

Reviewing for a *Quarterly* is an interesting business. At times you write a review before any other notice appears, and the comparison of your verdict with those of others is always a pleasant occupation. At times you do not get to a book until you have read other notices, which almost, in spite of yourself, predispose you to praise or blame. Abbé Dimnet's *The Art of Thinking* (Cape, 6s.) was in the latter class: I opened it with the knowledge that it was an American "best seller", and that X, Y, and Z thought highly of it. Possibly it is to that cause that my disappointment must be attributed, for the book strikes me as being made up of bright, glittering superficialities. It is always lucid, but contains many sparkling generalizations that do not help very much, while a good deal of platitudinizing is mixed up with considerable ingenuity in presenting the truths of psychology in popular fashion.

Under the title *The Sense of Glory* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) Mr. Herbert Read has reprinted nine papers from the *Times Literary Supplement*. They deal with Froissart, Malory, Descartes, Swift, Vauvenargues, Sterne, Hawthorne, Bagehot, and Henry James. They go well together, though it is hard to believe that Bagehot—or even Hawthorne and James—have ever been associated with glory before!

We must be allowed to suspend judgment on Mr. Mark Van Doren's *An Anthology of World Poetry* (Cassell, 10s. 6d.), for it is only by time and use that one can estimate a collection which contains 1,222 pp. of poems culled from 17 languages from Chinese to English, and from 3500 B.C. to 1929 A.D. Mr. Van Doren's plan has been to include only those poems that have been adequately translated into English: Pindar is thus omitted, though Cowley, Swift, Ben Jonson, Herrick, Byron, and many more swell out Martial's pages. Waley is, of course, the main stand-by for Chinese and Japanese. But a hundred and one points for discussion and enquiry suggest themselves as we turn the pages. We can only recommend readers to examine for themselves a collection as remarkable as it is cheap.

In *Selected Poems* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) Mr. W. B. Yeats has arranged chronologically "whatever lyrical and narrative poems of mine best please my friends or myself or best illuminate one another". They range from *Crossways* in 1889 to *The Tower* in 1928.

Very neat and tasteful are the volumes in "The County Anthologies" series (Mathews & Marrot, 6s., 3s., and 2s. 6d.), the first three of which are *Yorkshire*, *Derbyshire*, and *Lanarkshire*. Mr. R. Pape Cowell is the general editor, and the compilers draw on both prose and verse in the attempt "to survey and illustrate the debt of English literature to the scenery and special genius of individual counties". Anthologies are largely a matter of individual taste, but we should have liked to see a little more dialect in the *Yorkshire* volume: and while we appreciate the tributes that "furriners" like Scott and Wordsworth pay to our county, its natives might have been drawn on a little more!

Equally attractive is the "English Heritage" series, edited by Lord Lee and Mr. J. C. Squire, and delightfully introduced by Mr. Stanley Baldwin. The opening volumes have been carefully chosen, and while they differ widely in both content and style, they are alike in being readable—and worth reading. They are Mr. John Bailey's *Shakespeare*, Mr. Bernard Darwin's *The English Public School*, Mr. Eric Parker's *English Wild Life*, and Mr. J. B. Priestley's *English Humour* (Longmans, 3s. 6d. each).

Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's third series of *Studies in Literature* (Cambridge Press, 10s. 6d.) is as delightful as its predecessors. We specially enjoyed the papers on Coventry Patmore, W. S. Gilbert, and "The New Reading Public".

Vols. 10 and 11 of the Hogarth Lectures (Hogarth Press, 3s. 6d.) are Mr. Humbert Wolfe's *Notes on English Verse Satire* and Mr. G. D. H. Cole's *Politics and Literature*. Mr. Wolfe's lively sketch surveys the subject from Chaucer and Skelton to Chesterton and Sassoon. The title of Mr. Cole's book is certainly misleading. It deals with this country only, begins only with the seventeenth century, and suddenly stops short with Shelley, Coleridge, and Byron. What there is is good—though there is more politics than literature—and the "Conclusion" is extremely apt. But a title should have been chosen which would have better indicated the range and limits of the essay.

No better way of beginning the study of the Icelandic Saga can be found than by reading Mr. E. E. Kellett's *The Northern Saga* (Hogarth Press, 7s. 6d.). After a readable and very useful Introduction, Mr. Kellett gives 130 pages to translations of fourteen of the stories.

Pride and Prejudice (Heinemann, 3s. 6d.) is a play in four acts adapted by Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Squire from the novel. Mr. and Mrs. Squire have managed to give a good deal of animation to the play, which, we imagine, would give Jane Austen considerable surprise could she see it.

We confess with shame that we had never read Goncharov's *Obломov* before receiving Miss Natalie Duddington's translation (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Now we have read it we wonder why its praises have not been more constantly and insistently proclaimed. It is the story of one whose life "was permeated by . . . primeval laziness, simplicity, peace, and inertia", and of an attempt—almost successful—of a woman "to carry you on her wings out of your stagnation". Zahar and Olga deserve immortality along with *Obломov*—and masterpiece is indeed the only correct description of the book.

Mr. Hugh Walpole has given us no finer character than the old man who gives his name to *Hans Frost* (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.). On his seventieth birthday a fresh young girl of nineteen—a niece—comes into the life of Hans Frost, whose books have made him a figure in the world, and whose position as a celebrity his wife, Ruth, makes it her business to maintain. Nathalie's influence proves altogether disturbing to the old man, who is shaken out of the coma of comfort into which he was gradually sinking. With wonderful skill Mr. Walpole describes their effect on each other, and its inevitable *dénouement*. The frustration of Ruth's schemes cannot but give pleasure to readers, but they will hope to learn how Nathalie and Vladimir get on.

Miss Aelfrida Tillyard's second novel, *The Way We Grow Up* (Hutchinson, 7s. 6d.) is the story of the way in which four Cambridge graduates faced life when they went down, and especially of one of them who was determined to lead the battle of youth against age. We enjoyed the book, but, while we are not surprised at anything that comes from Cambridge, we find it difficult to find anyone surviving a University course and remaining as unsophisticated as Roy.

Congregationalists, and especially Yorkshire Congregationalists, will read with great interest Mr. Gordon Stowell's *The History of Button Hill* (Gollancz, 10s. 6d.), for it is an account of the rise and fall of a suburb of the city of "Fleece", written round a forty years Congregational pastorate. It is well written and will hold the attention even of those who are quite ignorant of the locality. Our only objection is to the classification of the work as a novel. All the way through one is conscious that the writer is describing events which he has seen—and sometimes shared—rather than drawing on imagination. This is not to claim that a novelist cannot use his own experiences, but in this case we are continually tempted to identify, not merely places, but characters, always conscious that what we are reading is more or less history. As a study of a suburb which rapidly becomes down-town, and of organized Christianity's failure to cope with the changing situation, Button Hill is admirable. We hope, however, that now this book is out of the way Mr. Stowell will give rein to his imagination.

It was intriguing to find side by side on the table two books on education, one dealing with Africa, the other with England. Mr. A. V. Murray's *The School in the Bush* (Longman's, 12s. 6d.)—the not very happy title of "a critical study of the theory and practice of native education in Africa"—is based upon a nine months' tour undertaken with the special object of studying native education, and especially the training of teachers. Mr. Murray's book covers a tremendous amount of ground, for not only did he travel widely, but he tries to give us the background against which village life must be seen. Some of the things we first looked for are missing, but we found the volume full of information of a kind it would be difficult to find elsewhere, while Mr. Murray's comments are always fresh and penetrating.

In *The English Tradition of Education* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) the Headmaster of Harrow also covers a good deal of ground. He, too, has an almost impossible task, for he has practically set out to answer the question of the beaming gentleman from Tokio he mentions, who produced his notebook with the words, "By what methods do you produce the English Public School spirit?". Dr. Norwood believes that in our tradition of education we have at hand the instrument that can create an educated democracy; "the great hope of the world," he says, "lies in an education which is based on religion, on doing the Will of God, and whose end is before everything else the production of character; it must put right action before knowledge and right opinion." Beginning with a discussion of the public school—its religion, discipline, culture, athletics, etc.—he passes on to consider education in general, and ends with a section devoted to future prospects, in which he sees education triumphantly uniting the ideals expressed in Ford and Gandhi.

Volumes of children's addresses continue to pour forth. Here are three, very different, but all of them good, the first two, *Shells and Bits*

of *Glass and Nuts and Nut Crackers* (Independent Press, 2s. 6d.) by Congregational ministers, the Revs. B. R. H. Spaul and R. E. Thomas, and the Rev. John Macbeath's *Lamps and Lamplighters* (Carey Press, 2s. 6d.). From New Zealand comes the Rev. J. Cocker's *Keep Climbing* (Allenson, 3s. 6d.), which contains 26 addresses of a more conventional type, but of their kind very good, while the Rev. David Miller's *The Spider's Telephone Wire* (Allenson, 6s.), which is from Australia, benefits greatly by Mrs. Falkiner's illustrations.

A large book, no doubt intended as a gift book for children, is Miss Theodora W. Wilson's *The Parables of Our Lord* (R.T.S., 7s. 6d.), with sixteen coloured illustrations by Harold Copping. The combination of Miss Wilson and Mr. Copping is a good one, for both have achieved success in their respective fields.

A boy will desire no better book for a Christmas present than Mr. John Budden's *Further Adventures of Jungle John* (Longmans, 6s.), which we cordially commend.

EDITOR.

In his *Paul the Man, His Life and His Ministry* (Williams & Norgate, 5s.) Dr. C. E. Macartney tells in vigorous fashion the story of Paul's life as that life is understood by those untroubled by the researches of N.T. critics. His narrative is naturally chiefly based on *Acts*, but he supplements the story by reference to the *Epistles* and by that kind of picturesque description of places which a much-travelled man can use. The book makes no contribution to our understanding of Paul, but within its limits it may be very useful to Sunday School teachers and others who will prize its vivid style. The caption on the wrapper tells us that "it presents an intimate picture of the man rather than the theologian." We doubt if in Paul's case such a distinction has any meaning. To understand Paul, Luke's eirenical narrative helps less than Paul's intensely personal and often passionate own words. We get nearest to Paul as we study the *Epistles* in the light of the thought of his own age, instead of trying to transpose him directly into ours. This book has the great merit of being interesting, and may serve as a running commentary on the latter half of *Acts*.

A Critical Analysis of the Four Chief Pauline Epistles (Watts, 12s. 6d.) is a depressing book. Its author, Mr. L. Gordon Rylands, has obviously devoted to it much time and thought, but to the reviewer it seems a *reductio ad absurdum* of learned but unintelligent criticism. Holding that Paul was a Gnostic, the writer seeks to indicate the original nuclei of *Romans* and 1 and 2 *Cor.*, which may possibly be assigned to Paul. Thus of *Romans*, "disregarding minor interpolations," this nucleus is comprised in 1¹⁶-2²⁰, 6¹-7⁶, 8³-28, 38, 39, 12¹, 2, 11. *Galatians*, which surely is too personal and passionate to have been written by any but Paul, he regards as entirely non-Pauline, and assigns its original section to A.D. 90; its second addition to 120 A.D.; its third to 140 A.D. That seems to us simply impossible. It is hard to believe that this long book, for all its learning and its ability, will engage the attention of serious scholars.

SYDNEY CAVE.

If we can conceive the Editor of this *Quarterly* and the late Editor of the *Holborn Review* rolled into one, his name is Dr. Lowther Clarke. He reads, or rather "tears the heart out of", over 1,000 books a year and has a marvellous knowledge of current German theological literature. I am always disappointed if the monthly issue of *Theology* has no contribution

from him. In *New Testament Problems* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) he has happily gathered together a number of his essays, studies, and reviews, and the result is a very scholarly and stimulating volume. Perhaps one may single out "The Formgeschichtlich Method" and "Eduard Meyer on the Origins of Christianity", but the comments on certain Markan, Johannine, and Pauline texts runs them very close in a collection of twenty-three papers of which we would not willingly lose one.

There is nothing in Dr. van Rhyn's *Treasures of the Dust* (S.C.M., 4s. 6d.) that has not been before the English speaking reader for over twenty years and is familiar to all who know their Deissmann and Moulton, their Milligan and Meeham. The Dutch public for whom the book (here translated) is meant may have been less fortunate. The story and the significance of the papyri and "recently" discovered MSS. and inscriptions is, however, brightly told, and will no doubt have the charm of freshness to many people.

The Gospel of the Living Jesus (Macmillan, 10s.) is by T. H. Davies, M.A. Neither title-page nor preface furnishes any further information about the author, but his work reveals an intelligent and devout mind. It is a series of studies in the Gospel whose aim is to present the spiritual character of Jesus as an ever recreating dynamic.

The commendation given in January, 1926, to Dr. Joseph Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* (Allen & Unwin) on its first appearance is warmly endorsed on its re-issue at the cheaper price of 12s. 6d.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

"A study of Jesus' own personal experience of religion." So Dr. W. E. Bundy describes his book, *The Religion of Jesus* (Cassell, 12s. 6d.), with the amplifying comment that "all of his (Jesus') utterances are deeply personal; they are fresh extracts from his own experience". At first blush this does not hold out much prospect of freshness; but Dr. Bundy puts his points with distinctive force, and he has an effective method of sifting the wheat from the chaff, *i.e.*, what he deems the essential and permanently valuable elements in Jesus' outlook and teaching from the local and ephemeral. "To base the religious authority of Jesus on the Immaculate Conception, the Virgin Birth, the historicity of the nature-miracles, or even on the resurrection, is distorted devotion to primitive Christian values". Although his style suffers from redundancy, Dr. Bundy fulfils his promise of writing so that the layman can easily follow his argument. And, whether they do or do not agree with his conclusions, ministers may find it useful to study his way of doing what we all have to do—show our hearers how to penetrate through the forest of tradition and accretion to the real Jesus.

It is a pity that Dr. Robert Norwood, one of the New York clergy, has handicapped his book with such a title as *The Man Who Dared to be God, A Story of Jesus* (Scribners, 10s. 6d.), especially as it has no particular appropriateness as describing this new effort to give children in story-form an account of "the most important man this planet has produced". Jesus developed wonderful powers because he found God; but he did not work miracles, "if by that word you understand magic". This sufficiently indicates the theological standpoint of a book written with lively imagination and picturesqueness. Certain passages in the Foreword and in the story itself call for adult interpretation to make them fully intelligible to "the children of this generation" to whom the volume is dedicated.

"No one will ever know what any bishop really believes." Dr. Masterman, who is, of course, Bishop of Plymouth, quotes this hard saying of a recent writer, and, surely needlessly, enters the plea that he "does really believe" all that he writes in *The Christianity of To-morrow* (Cassell, 7s. 6d.). His thinking is of the steadily progressive order, and on various aspects of present-day religion he is an admirable guide for the many thoughtful Anglicans who do not want to go too fast, and yet do not want to stand still.

Why Am I a Christian? (Cassell, 3s. 6d.) is a series of Lenten addresses in the Bishop of London's well-known manner. An interesting feature is the presentation of questions and answers arising out of the addresses as they were delivered. This section of the book reminds us of what we are apt to forget, that, from time to time, Dr. Ingram has done useful apologetic work of the more simple and direct sort.

ARTHUR PRINGLE.

The Middle Ages are no longer the Dark Ages. Light has been poured upon them in recent years from all sides. Nevertheless further illumination as to their nature and character is always welcome. Since the modern world has learned to estimate the true value of its medieval predecessor, it is always ready for anything that contributes to a clearer view of what it was. In *Latin Thought during the Middle Ages* (Oxford Press, 5s.), the Professor of Italian in the University of Oxford (Prof. Cesare Foligno) has contributed a short study of the place of the Roman and Latin tradition in the making of the medieval order. He examines the resistance of the new peoples to this tradition and their assimilation of it. He shows how even in the worst and stormiest days the Roman tradition was never lost, and how in the end it re-asserted itself and what new forms were developed from it. There is a careful study of the place of Latin as a means of culture and an exhibition of the alternate attraction and repulsion which the Latin classics exercised upon the medieval Church. The theme is illustrated from abundant knowledge, and many interesting observations are made by the way.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

After historical outlines of the British Hegelian contentings (Part I), and of movements of recoil (Part II) the Rev. E. G. Braham's *Ourselves and Reality* (Sharp, 10s. 6d.) states the author's own case for Divine personality and for the immortality of man (Part III). One fails to discern a definite progress of thought uniting the manifold details; and one deplores an incredible multitude of misprints or carelessnesses; A. E. Taylor's "Problems of Conduct"; "T. H. Muirhead"; "*Drie* Buecher"; "G. C. S. Schille"; "Hermann" [of Marburg], four times over; "Tyrrel" "Troelsch"; "cosmogany"; "affirmity". On p. 201, James Ward is made to write bad grammar; Browning is massacred on p. 217. Nor are graver errors lacking. P. 177, Henry Jones was "only slightly influenced by Hegel—perhaps indirectly, through Lotze". This of Jones, Edward Caird's favourite pupil, selected on Caird's instigation to succeed him at Glasgow! Has Mr. Braham ever read Jones's attack on Lotze? P. 170; Ritschl "will not pronounce upon the historical existence of Christ"!!! What next?

British scholarship gains nothing in *éclat* from such work as this.

Prof. Hans Driesch, eminent in science, is also deeply interested in the problems of philosophy, as (*e.g.*) his Gifford Lectures have shown. The

present short volume, *Man and the Universe* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is intended for the general reader. The characterization on the jacket—"inspired by a generous revolt against the domination of will and intellect"—is somewhat misleading; the author makes room indeed for faith, but all knowledge—according to him—is to be acquired by intellectual processes. Reality includes those vital "entelechies" of which Driesch is the champion, as well as mechanical causes; and by that discovery intellect justifies the spirit's revolt against fate. Yet, strangely, the discussion of free-will ends in a *non liquet*; and, while immortality in some "worthy" sense is pronounced morally inevitable, the thought of God seems wondrous obscure.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Dr. A. C. Ewing's *The Morality of Punishment* (Kegan Paul, 10s. 6d.) investigates the general moral principles involved in the practice of punishment. He examines the various theories, the retributive, the deterrent, and the reformatory. Retribution, the eye for an eye theory, though the oldest justification of punishment, the rough justice which repays the criminal in kind, seems to have neither logical nor ethical ground. It is no more than getting one's own back. Is the deterrent theory any better? It tends to become inhumanly severe and disregards the truth that punishment should be educative, reformatory. Dr. Ewing discusses fully the methods of educative punishment, and the parallel problem of rewards. He sets out a list of objections to State punishment. Finally and inevitably the discussion passes on to outline certain aspects of a general theory of ethics. The author thinks that the nature of evil is to become worse when practised until it ultimately dissatisfies and is followed by a reaction towards good. It is in the nature of things that crime is its own punishment.

The book is a full and interesting treatment of a subject which has not been much written about lately.

Dr. George Walker's *The Idealism of Christian Ethics* (Clark, 7s.) contains the Baird Lectures delivered in the University of Aberdeen by the Minister of the East Parish of St. Nicholas. They treat the Christian ethic in comparison with other systems, Greek, Buddhist, or evolutionary, and show that while Christianity does not abolish the moral gains of other ages, it completes them by adding a new ideal, both for the individual and society. There is a full and careful discussion of the Kingdom of God, of the several Christian virtues, as also of the two great commandments, and a final chapter on the power of the Spirit to create a new life in man.

H. B. SHEPHEARD.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

EMIL LUDWIG. Goethe. Putnam. 2 vols. 15s. Popular Edition.

J. RAMSAY MACDONALD. *Margaret Ethel Macdonald*. Allen & Unwin. 5s. 11th Impression (8th Edition) of the Prime Minister's beautiful memoir, with a new prefatory note.

MRS. C. S. PEEL. *A Hundred Wonderful Years*. "Being an account of social and domestic life in England from 1820 to 1920." Bodley Head. 8s. 6d. Cheaper ed. of a book first published in 1926.

HENRI DE CATT. *Frederick the Great*. Constable's Miscellany. 2 vols. 8s. 6d. each.

- H. W. FOWLER. *If Wishes were Horses*. Allen & Unwin. 6s. These essays by the arbiter of "Modern English Usage" were published in 1907 under the title *Si Mihi*—! and the name "Egomel."
- EDWARD GRUBB. *What is Quakerism?* Allen & Unwin. 4s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. 3rd completely revised ed. of a book first published in 1917.
- PAUL POPENOE. *Modern Marriage: A Handbook*. Macmillan. 8s. 6d. First published, 1925.

LECTURES, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

- W. B. SELBIE. *The Christian Ethic in the Individual, the Family, and the State*. Sharp. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d. The Beckly Lecture. A clear and candid utterance.
- W. DOUGLAS MACKENZIE. *Man's Consciousness of Immortality*. Harvard & Oxford Univ. Presses. 4s. 6d. Ingersoll Lecture.
- A. D. LINDSAY. *The Essentials of Democracy*. Oxford Univ. Press. 3s. 6d. Wm. J. Cooper Lectures.
- C. G. MONTEFIORE. *IV Ezra*. Allen & Unwin. 2s. and 1s. Arthur Davis Memorial Lecture. "A Study in the Development of Universalism."
- K. E. INNES. *The Reign of Law*. Hogarth Press. 1s. 6d. "A Short and Simple Introduction to the Work of the Permanent Court of International Justice."
- W. J. ROWLAND. *Some Difficulties of the Burial Law in Cemeteries*. Liberation Society. 6d.
- F. H. BALLARD. *Justification by Faith*. Indep. Press. 3d.
- A. J. COSTAIN. *The Jamboree, 1929*. Sharp. 2d. An Address by the Head Master of Rydal School.
- A. S. ROWNTREE. *Colleges for the People*. Educational Settlements Association. 2d.

ALSO RECEIVED.

- A Short Bible in the A.I.F.* Chosen and arranged by the Bishop of Liverpool and others. Blackwell. 3s. 6d. and (School ed.) 2s. 6d.
- The School Bible. Selections from the A.I.F.* Nelson. 2s.
- "The Study Bible"—4 new vols. Cassell. 3s. 6d. each. *Major Prophets* (Bp. of Durham, Dr. Wheeler Robinson and Dr. Lofthouse); *Minor Prophets* (Bp. of Plymouth and Dr. Box); *Corinthians* (Bp. of Middleton and Dr. Underwood); *Ephesians to Philemon* (Dr. Orchard and Dr. N. P. Williams).
- AUGUSTA A. TEMPLE. *Flowers and Trees of Palestine*. S.P.C.K. 6s. Introduction, Alphabetical List, and 30 Illustrations.
- W. H. S. JONES. *What did Jesus Mean?* Heffer. 1s. 6d. An Essay.
- PAUL B. BULL. *The Way of Conversion*. Faith Press. 3s. and 2s.; *Instructions on the Atonement*. Faith Press. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.
- J. EMMYS MORIARTY. *The Unending Benediction*; GWILYM REES. *How to Handle Life*. Stockwell. 2s. 6d. each.
- HORACE COLLY. *The Parable of the Potter, and Other Sermons*. Sharp. 3s.
- ARCHER WALLACE. *Blazing New Trails*. Allenson. 2s. 6d. Stories of 15 Mission Pioneers.
- A. CHESTER MANN. *F. B. Meyer*. Allen & Unwin. 3s. 6d.
- RENDEL HARRIS. *A New Stonehenge; Barley; Minister; Mustard*. Heffer, 2s. each. "Caravan Essays," in which Dr. Harris continues to find traces of Egypt in England.
- R. F. MOORSHEAD. "Heal the Sick." Carey Press. 3s. 6d. The Story of the 25 Years' Work of the Medical Mission Auxiliary of the Baptist Missionary Society, by the Society's Medical Secretary.

- H. FLEMING. *The Lighted Mind*. Friends' Book Centre. 1s. 6d. "The Challenge of Adult Education to Quakerism."
 C. EDMUND MAURICE. *Poems*. Methuen. 5s.
 F. L. WHEELER. *Modernity*. Williams & Norgate. 3s. 6d.

REPORTS, LESSON COURSES, ETC.

- Advance*. 130th Annual Report of the Religious Tract Society. R.T.S. 2s. 6d.
Keswick Convention, 1929. Pickering & Inglis. 4s. and 2s. 6d.
Purpose. 35th Annual Report of the Student Christian Movement. S.C.M. 6d.
Concise Guides to Primary, Junior (or International) and Intermediate Lessons for 1930; Notes on the Scripture Lessons (Uniform, 1930). N.S.S.U. 4s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. each; *Notes on the Morning Lessons*. N.S.S.U. 2s. 6d.; *Pocket Notes*. N.S.S.U. 1s. 9d., 2s. 3d., and 2s. 9d.
The Claims of Life. Adult School Lesson Handbook, 1930. N.A.S.U. 2s. 6d. and 1s. 6d.; *The Bible and Social Reform*. Study Outlines. N.A.S.U. 6d.
 MESSRS. PICKERING & INGLIS send a selection of their Golden Grain Diaries and Almanacs (various prices), and of their stories as follows: Robt. Simpson, *Martyrland*, 2s. 6d.; Charlotte Murray, *Love Conquereth*, 2s.; S. E. Burrow, *Brindlewood Farm*, 1s. 6d.; E. Everett Green, *Her Husband's Home*, 2s. 6d.; Flora Berry, *Neta Lyall*, 2s.; G. Pettman, *For Coronet or Crown?*, 1s. 6d. Also James Smith, *Handfuls of Purpose*, Vol. X, 4s.; J. B. Watson, *The Sinless Saviour*, 2s. 6d.; G. Goodman, *Great Truth Simply Stated*, 2s. 6d.; Jesse Page, *Capt. Allen Gardiner of Patagonia*, 2s.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn Review (October). Prof. W. L. Wardle has been given the difficult task of succeeding Dr. Peake as Editor. The next number is to be a Peake Memorial Number: this issue contains tributes by Profs. Wardle and Humphries. Among the articles are the Rev. H. J. Flowers's "The Modern Value of the New Testament" and the Rev. J. C. Mantripp's "Idealism and the Church." There are five literary articles, in one of which the Rev. R. Newman Wycherley gives a needed warning about Froude's *Bunyan*.

The Hibbert Journal (October). The first three articles deal with economic questions—Principal Barratt Brown's "Machinery—A Blessing or a Curse," Mr. G. A. Johnston's "The Rationalisation of Consumption," and Prof. G. H. Turnbull's "The Linking of Education and Occupation." Mr. Edmond Holmes criticises Prof. Alexander's new realism, Mr. G. M. Sargeant writes on "The Death of Plato." Two articles deal with the Fourth Gospel—Prof. B. W. Bacon's "History and Dogma in John," and Dr. C. F. Nolloth's "The Fourth Gospel and Its Critics." The Bishop of Madras writes on "Church Union in South India." The three most interesting contributions are Dr. Hugh Brown's "'Playing the Game' As Divine," Mr. C. G. Montefiore's "The Originality of Jesus," and Prof. A. W. Vernon's "Is Religion to be De-personalised?"

The London Quarterly (October). The Rev. W. E. Garman opens with a strong plea for the Scheme of Church Union in South India. Dr. Ballard writes trenchantly on Dr. Orchard's *The Present Crisis in Religion*. Among other articles are Mr. Lovat-Fraser's "Andrew Jackson," the Rev. S. G. Dimond's "Euripides," and the Rev. W. Wood's "God and the Moral Law."

The Baptist Quarterly (October). The chief articles are "William Medley and Friedrich von Hügel" (Rev. P. F. Chambers), "Authority" (Rev. S. Rupert Ward) and "Christian Traditions: Their Value and Their Channels" (unsigned).

The Modern Churchman (September-November). The Conference Number, dealing with "The Problem of Authority." Dean Inge gave the opening address, fourteen speakers, among them Prof. Ernest Barker, Prof. W. R. Sorley,

and Principal Galloway, dealt with various aspects of the subject, and two sermons were delivered. Dr. Major writes an Introduction. There is much that calls for careful thought in the volume, but much, too, that seems academic and remote from practical considerations.

The Church Quarterly Review (October). The Bishop of Gloucester writes on "Two Lives of Christ" (Bishop Gore's and Prof. F. C. Burkitt's), Miss A. M. Cooke on "St. Francis of Assisi," the Rev. C. T. Harley Walker on "Religious Conditions in Rumania," the Rev. Edgar Vincent on "Some Aspects of the English Reformation," and Miss E. L. Veitch on "Fortunatus." There are some learned notices of books. A welcome article is Dr. E. J. Martin's "Thomas Edward Brown."

The Expository Times (August-November). The "Books that have influenced our Epoch" which are discussed are Moberly's *Atonement and Personality* (Dr. N. P. Williams), *Literature and Dogma* (Dr. Moffatt), *Sartor Resartus* (Dr. W. P. Paterson) and *The Religion of the Semites* (Rev. W. M. Mathieson). Prof. H. R. Mackintosh writes on the Scottish Union: Congregational contributors are Dr. Selbie, who writes an appreciation of Dr. Peake, and the Rev. J. Emrys Morgan, whose subject is "The Church as the Home of the Spiritual Life."

Friends' Quarterly Examiner (Tenth Month). "From the House of the Four Winds" examines a problem which puzzles the Friends as it puzzles all the Churches about their own young people: "Why do two-thirds of children who are Quakers when they leave school cease to be Quakers?" Mary L. Robinson writes on "The Mysticism of the Society of Friends: A Study in Silence," J. S. Hoyland on "The Hindu Belief in Re-Incarnation," and Leonard Wigham on "Early Chinese Philosophers." Mrs. Holdsworth continues to tell of "Haleyon Days in New Zealand," and there is a very interesting article on birds.

The Review of the Churches (October). Among the many striking articles in this number we found most suggestive the Rev. H. H. Farmer's "The Task of Modern Evangelisation," Mr. Arnold Lunn's "A Challenge to Pacifists," and Dr. Lynch's "Candidates for the Ministry in the U.S.A." Two articles deal with the union of the Scottish Churches, and two with the Lateran Treaty. Dr. Coulton thwacks Mr. Belloc, Prof. Claude Jenkins writes on F. D. Maurice, and Mr. Edward Grubb on "Spirituality in Religion."

The British Journal of Inebriety (October). The papers in this number are Dr. McAdam Eccles's "Some Gaps in the Scientific Study of Inebriety," Sir William Willcox's "The Toxic Effects of Methylated Spirits and Impure Forms of Alcohol," and Dr. P. B. Wilkinson's "Cannabis Indica: An Historical and Pharmacological Study of the Drug." The 30 pages given to book reviews are very useful.

The International Review of Missions (October). Dr. D. M. Donaldson writes on "The First Missionaries to the Parthians," Dr. J. L. Barton on "The Near East Relief." On the Bishop of Dornakal's "Living Forces Behind Mass Movements" we comment in the Editorial. Dr. H. T. Hodgkin's "The Constructive Task of the Church in China" is very important; Mr. F. T. B. Friis's "Mandates and Missions" is timely. Two medical men, Dr. Vaughan and Dr. Dodd, discuss "Medical Missionary Policy and the Health of Missionaries," and there is the usual bibliography.

World Dominion (October). The Editorial deals with pagan Britain, Mr. Arthur Black with pagan London. Thus beginning from Jerusalem the journal then reaches out to the uttermost parts of the earth, the concluding article, by Dr. J. A. Mackay, dealing with "Spiritual Spring-Time in Latin America."

The Evangelical Quarterly (October). The main articles are Prof. A. H. Sayce's "Archæology and the Old Testament," Mr. A. Stuart's "Genesis and Geology," Dr. E. C. Unmack's "Why We Reject the Apocrypha," the Rev. W. Graham Scroggie's "Why We Are Protestants," and Prof. T. C. Johnson's "Justification by Faith." In the five lines given to our last issue there are only four mistakes!

The Yale Review (Autumn). Mr. Walter Lippmann pleads for a statesman-like approach to the problem of Law Enforcement, and Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe writes on "England Looks Towards America." Mme. Edib discusses "Dictatorship and Reforms in Turkey," Mr. Ray Morris "Economic Changes in South America," Prof. de Madariaga "New Life in Spain." Mr. Gamaliel Bradford writes of the life of Catharine the Great under the title "Eve Enthroned," and there is a story by Mr. Walter de la Mare.

The Review and Expositor (Bapt., Louisville, Kentucky, October). Dr. C. H. Nash writes on "The Foundation and Superstructure of the Church of Jesus Christ," and Dr. W. E. Henry on "The Search for Truth." Dr. W. T. Whitley contributes an interesting study of the early church under the title "From Variety Towards Uniformity."

The Anglican Theological Review (October). Dr. C. L. Dibble writes usefully on "Contrasted Philosophies of Christianity," and Dr. F. J. Hall on "Catholic Christology Grandly Vindicated"—a review of the Rev. L. S. Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*. The Editor contributes a reading course on "The History of Christian Thought," and Dr. F. H. Hallock has a learned article on "Coptic Gnostic Writings."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE FREE CHURCHES AND UNITY.

Sir,—May I bear my grateful testimony to the admirable paper by Mr. Parry on this subject. One can heartily endorse almost every word of it, and the whole of its spirit and outlook, without qualification. But I venture to take exception to the statement that in reference to Reunion "probably the greatest difficulty of all is the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration." I find it difficult to argue at all about this revival of an ancient pagan doctrine which seems to me to impute to the Father of spirits an incredible pettiness and cruelty. But surely the fact that this rite is held to be "valid" among Roman Catholics if administered by a midwife or anyone else in an emergency removes it to a secondary place.

I submit that the primary and supreme difficulty is the belief in priesthood, whether with or without Apostolic Succession. The Prayer Book is saturated with this utterly unchristian doctrine, as any thoughtful reader can see. It obtrudes itself in all the services of Ordination, in the service of Holy Communion, in the pronouncement of the Absolution, &c. This surely is the bed rock of the sacramental system, in both the Anglican and Roman Churches, and they both inherited and adapted it from the pagan cults of Babylon and Egypt. Once get rid of the priest, and baptism would, like all other items of ritual, sink into comparative insignificance.

Yours truly,

J. E. FLOWER.

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

It would be well to remind ourselves, in this year of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Sunday Schools, that we should not let the question of week-day education engross all our thought and attention. This is surely the right time for the Churches to study the history of religious education and investigate its future prospects. An inspection conducted with the thoroughness of a Board of Education inspection of Secondary Schools would produce a revealing and disquieting Report. It would no doubt be pointed out that to no part of the work of the Christian Church has more devoted and sacrificial service been given than to Sunday Schools, and that in no part have there been less satisfactory results. Thousands of good men and women, we should be told, have taken their work seriously, and yet it cannot be claimed, in the light of the disclosures of *The Army and Religion* during the War, and of the widespread ignorance of the Bible and of Christianity to-day, that Sunday Schools have done more than touch the fringe of their problem. The little leaven has in no wise leavened the lump, and the Churches seem farther than half-a-century ago from growing a generation of Christians, educated in the faith.

An excellent and challenging survey of the situation has recently been forthcoming in Prof. G. A. Coe's *What is Christian Education?* (Scribners, 10s. 6d.). Prof. Coe is an acknowledged authority, and, while the atmosphere of his book is American, its analysis is of general significance. Nor does it confine itself to Sunday Schools: one preacher, at any rate, has been compelled by it to examine his own preaching, and see how it stands the test looked at from the point of view of Christian education.

Prof. Coe makes no bones about the work done by the churches. Efficient teaching, he finds, is rare:

"in the by and large, it is in the hands of incompetent teachers who give to it only the fag ends of their time and energy. . . . Protestantism as a whole is attempting to transmit Christianity through teachers who, as a rule, are incompetent as teachers but competent as Christians".

He goes on to point out that

"the present methods of biblical instruction lead laymen to form historical judgments without historical information, and to hang their religion upon dislocated, distorted, and even imaginary facts and events. . . . We are in danger, in fact, of having two kinds of religion side by side—an esoteric one for scholars and an exoteric one for the people".

It is therefore desirable that there should be, both in content and method, continuity between pulpit teaching and the teaching of the school, so that a true Christian education may be secured.

So far Professor Coe. Is it not correct to say that the greatest challenge to the Church—yes, and the test by which the Church will stand or fall—is to be found in this matter of Christian education? Here and there are promising signs, such as the Adult School Handbook and the rise of Training Colleges for Sunday School teachers, but on the whole the outlook is distinctly discouraging. The proportion of schools graded and run on educationally efficient methods is still woefully low, and in cities where Sunday games are allowed it is clear that only the fittest children—and schools—will survive.

The American system, by which a church appoints a Director of Religious Education, has never had a fair trial here, largely for financial reasons. There is therefore all the more need, especially in churches where the minister is the only person with a knowledge of education, that time should be made for ministers to be in the closest contact with their Schools—with the scholars themselves as well as with the teachers in their Training Classes. Adults should not insist that a minister prepare for them three sermons a week at the expense of little children, whose lives would so quickly respond to the influence a minister might have upon them—did he get the chance to know them. And especially let Dr. Coe's advice be followed, and the teaching of church and school carefully co-ordinated.

WE sometimes wonder as we listen to sermons—and we hear one preacher fairly often—whether it would be a good thing if the Churches had an Order of preaching specialists. So often we hear a sermon that might have been tremendously powerful had the preacher only been able to work on his subject and the method of its presentation. The average preacher, as has been suggested above, has but a limited time for thought and reading, and often he takes into the pulpit what he knows is only second or third rate, but which he knows equally well could have been vastly improved had time permitted. If we had preachers who could preach with the assurance and mastery with which Lindrum plays billiards! But that only happens when a man is willing to say, "This one thing I do!"

How far is it possible for the Congregational Churches to set aside an Order of Preachers, men whose time shall be given solely to the preparation of an effective message? Such an Order would, of course, have its dangers. It would be fatal if it came to mean that men were engaged on the facile task of declaiming "travellers", or if they lived out of contact with common life. But it need mean neither of these things any more than it need mean the apotheosis of the rhetorician. Such men as were called to preach would need to be

prophets indeed—and they would be the first to watch themselves and suspect if art were becoming artifice.

How much could not be done by a dozen men of this type? The day of the preacher is not over. But the average minister has not time to preach as he knows he could preach: he is overwhelmed by the call of committees, the oversight of organizations without number, and the demands of countless duties. Can a way not be found to set some men at liberty so that the Gospel may have free course to run and be glorified?

ALL who believe in liberty should be grateful to Lord Hewart for bringing before a wider public the facts that constitute *The New Despotism* (Benn, 21s.). In recent years there has been a definite trend in the direction of introducing into legislative Acts clauses which give almost unlimited powers to Government Departments—which often, in practice, means to permanent officials in those Departments.

By quoting numerous cases and statistics Lord Hewart pillories the methods of the new despotism, shows how it modifies the provisions of statutes, takes power to determine as the Minister thinks fit, secures that the Minister's decision shall be final and conclusive and his order not subject to appeal in any Court, that his rules, orders, and regulations shall have effect as if enacted in the Act, and that the making of an order shall be evidence that the requirements of the statute have been complied with. Over against these he places the methods of a Court of Law where: "(1) the judge is identified and is personally responsible for his decisions; (2) the case, subject to rare exceptions, is conducted in public; (3) the result is governed by the impartial application of principles which are known and established, and (4) all parties to the controversy are fully and fairly heard".

It is not only in the State that the rights of the individual are slowly being nibbled away: even Congregationalists need to be reminded that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. In the individual church the decay of the church meeting and the lack of a sense of responsibility in the church member mean that more and more power is left in the hands of the executive—the minister, the deacons, or even the secretary. In the wider concerns of the denomination the same thing is true. As the work develops, less and less consideration is given to it by the Assembly—often five minutes a year has to suffice for the survey and discussion of an important branch of the denomination's activity. Congregationalists, of all people, must guard carefully the rights of the individual member of the Church and of the Assembly, securing ample provision for the expression of opinion and the discussion of policy.

IN returning to the question of South India we must inevitably mention the excellent number of the *Review of the Churches* devoted to the subject. An American Congregationalist, Dr. Banninga, explains the Scheme, which is then discussed by Bishop Palmer, Canon Douglas, and the Rev. W. H. G. Holmes (Anglicans); Dr. Scott Lidgett (Methodist); Dr. Adams Brown and the Rev. W. Paton (Presbyterians); and Dr. Garvie, the Rev. Godfrey Phillips, and the Rev. H. W. Newell (Congregationalists).

A careful reading of this number is demanded of all Christian people. Mr. Holmes, of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, in a contribution that is valuable because it is so extraordinarily frank, states that while for 25 years he has had to face all manner of questions by non-Christians, the number of those perplexed by the presence of different Christian societies could be counted on the fingers of one hand. Mr. Holmes holds that, however logical Congregationalism may be, it cannot be made to fit the teaching of the New Testament. Did he not believe that Christ ordained the ministry, he would become a Congregationalist at once. To say God has blessed invalid ministries is no criterion, for the same test could be applied to Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism.

The Congregational contributions are specially interesting. Mr. Phillips, who regretted the fact that when the South India United Church was formed Congregationalists had greatly to restrict the practice by which duly appointed laymen could administer the sacraments, now confesses that this practice must disappear altogether. Dr. Garvie, in a careful and valuable contribution, gives a good deal of time to meeting the objections of the Rev. A. H. Legg, a missionary on the Field. The cause of Christian Union is very dear to Dr. Garvie's heart, and no one has served it with greater devotion. Sometimes, however, in striving to make the greatest possible concession to meet Anglicans, he seems to overlook the Baptists, with whom Congregationalists have natural affinities. Mr. Newell, also a missionary, is specially concerned to point out that not only are the Baptist and the Methodist Episcopal Churches in South India unwilling to accept the present Scheme, but the North India Conference to "consider the first steps towards a United Church did not show signs of reaching unanimity on the basis of an episcopal form of government at all".

* * *

RECENT weeks have seen the publication of many letters, books, and pamphlets on the subject, most of them written with the forthcoming Lambeth Conference in mind. So that it may be seen at a glance what leading Anglicans are thinking, we summarize some of them.

1. Bishop Palmer, whose astute mind is behind the Scheme, writing to *The Times* in answer to Lord Hugh Cecil's objection that the Scheme "treats episcopacy as an open question," said :

The scheme provides that there shall be Bishops in the united Church, and that "continuity with the historic episcopate shall both initially and thereafter be effectively maintained"; that the Bishops shall perform all the historic functions of Bishops, and in particular that they shall be the only necessary ministers of ordination. A Church which has such rules does not "treat episcopacy as an open question", and neither the exceptions proposed to be made "to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry" during the lifetime of certain ministers, nor the refusal to insist on "any particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate" can shake the conclusion which must be drawn from the remainder of the constitution.

2. The Bishop of Pretoria, Dr. Neville Talbot, in an open-minded little pamphlet, *Before We Meet* (Longmans, 2s.) suddenly deserts the line of his argument to say that it is "overwhelmingly clear" to him that "that which acts as the organ and expression of the visible unity of Church, as given by God, and not made by man", is to be found in Episcopacy.
3. The Bishop in Korea (Dr. Trollope), after a life-time on the Mission Field, says that he has never met a native non-Christian critic who had urged as an objection against Christianity the divisions among Christians. His "*The Peace of Jerusalem*" (Mowbray, 6d.) urges that the demand for union in South India is neither unanimous nor spontaneous. He feels the Anglo-Catholic view so strongly that, did the Lambeth Conference or the See of Canterbury recognize non-episcopal ministries for thirty years, he doubts whether he could continue his office.
4. Prof. N. P. Williams's *Lausanne, Lambeth, and South India* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.) is the most important contribution to the discussion yet made. His lucid statement of the reasons for opposition to the Scheme shows the Anglo-Catholic position in stark outline. To Prof. Williams the "historic episcopate" implies apostolic succession: apostolic ministries are those of men ordained by bishops: other ministries, like those of Free Churchmen, are prophetic. There is nothing

"objectionable in the statement that reunion need and should not involve the acceptance of any particular theory of the origin of any office in the official ministry, *provided* that this is coupled with an affirmation of the Dominical origin of that ministry as a whole, and of its continuous identity, preserved by the chain of sacramental ordination, with the Apostolic ministry".

Therefore

"the Anglican Communion is bound . . . to maintain its existing rule, which suffers no man to stand at the Lord's Table to consecrate the Eucharist unless he hath or formerly have had episcopal consecration or ordination. It will be as much a duty for English Churchmen to resist attempts on the part of Prophets to celebrate the Eucharist within the communion of Canterbury, as it was a duty for Cyprian to resist the attempts of 'Confessors' to absolve within the jurisdiction of Carthage".

To the South India proposals Prof. Williams suggests this alternative. The South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church should unite forthwith, organizing in the same way (with the same dioceses and the three-fold ministry) as if the Anglicans had come in. The Anglican Bishops would then offer to confer on the other bishops the "historic episcopate" !

"It would be understood that, after the consummation of organic re-union, occasional ministrations by visiting non-episcopally-ordained ministers would not be possible."

5. Canon A. E. J. Rawlinson's *The Church of England and the Church of Christ* (Longmans, 5s.) deserves careful attention, the section devoted to the relation of the Visible to the Invisible Church being specially useful. But even he has to say :

"Organic and corporate re-union implies clearly agreement as to who is, or is not, entitled or authorised in practice to minister and to celebrate the Eucharist on behalf of the Church : and the principle of explicit authorisation to act in the name of Christ on behalf of the Church appears to be more adequately expressed and more adequately safeguarded by episcopal ordination in the historic succession of the ministry than by other . . . systems. In the long run, and from the point of view of any hoped-for reunion, an eventually universal episcopate would appear to be the one possible form of Church order."

Finally Bishop F. J. Hall comes from across the Atlantic to dot the i's and cross the t's of his Anglo-Catholic brethren, and make sure that they give nothing away. His *Christian Union in Ecumenical Light* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.) concludes by speaking of

". . . the Catholic belief, shared in by 'high' Presbyterians but emphatically rejected by Congregationalists, that for permanent stewardship of the mysteries of God an official ministry was instituted by the Lord and His Holy Spirit in apostolic days, with the purpose that it should perpetuate itself in unbroken succession, without substantial change of its original form, unto the end of the world. The major part of Christendom still retains after many centuries the belief that the perpetuation of this stewardship and transmission of the Lord's pastoral commission was devolved under the Spirit's guidance by the Apostles on what subsequent generations have entitled the Episcopate. The authoritative stewardship of divine mysteries is involved, and the reason for insisting upon the Episcopate, and upon common recognition of its divine appointment, is far more than a matter of external government. It is that the Lord's ministerial arrangements for His Church must be perpetuated, if the mysteries which He committed to the Apostles are to be preserved, and are to be ministered without subversive change and without loss of the divinely provided guarantee of valid sacramental functioning. Modern experience proves conclusively that abandonment of the historic Episcopate carries with it the loss of vital elements of the ancient Faith and Order of the undivided Church. I may not omit to remind my readers, in conclusion, that the recovery by non-episcopal Churches of these elements is an unescapable condition of full Christian reunion. Agreement as to the ministry cannot avail for reunion of Christendom, if the mysteries committed to its stewardship

are not preserved in their integrity and accepted with sincere general agreement".

The position thus seems to be absolutely clear. The purpose is to make the "historic episcopate" dominant over the whole field, and the historic episcopate implies apostolic succession. Any values inherent in succession lie not in the fellowship of Christ's people, but in their officers, the bishops. Only those ordained by such officers will be allowed to minister the sacraments—no laymen, however worthy, no matter how much a local fellowship may desire him to do so. And as entry into the Church can only be through the sacrament of baptism, these officers will control such entry, while, of course, those who, like the Quakers, do not believe in special sacraments, will be outside the Church.

* * *

THESE conclusions seem inevitable from Anglican writings on South India. Nevertheless the South Indian Churches may feel that it is possible for two streams of ecclesiastical life to flow side by side, and they may be doing an incalculable service to the Kingdom of God by boldly attempting an experiment which seems too hazardous for Churches in Britain and America. Congregationalists in these lands have, we are confident, sufficient belief in liberty and in the guidance of the Holy Spirit to say to their brethren in South India, if they decide on carrying through the Union proposals: "We have serious misgivings about this Scheme, but you are on the spot, and you believe it is the right policy. If you have decided that in the long run it will help the work of the Kingdom, by all means go ahead—and God be with you".

* * *

WE cannot refrain from saying that behind the proposals for Church Union in many lands there seems to be a desire to make the Church of Christ a huge organization that shall be imposing by its very size. We live in a machine age, and churches are influenced by their surroundings: sometimes they are in danger of worshipping their own machinery and forgetting the power that drives it. We do not believe that this is Christ's way: the simpler organization is, the nearer it seems to the mind of Christ. That truth is central to our Congregational witness, which has always stressed *life* as against *organization*. Thus we cannot understand statements like, "Congregationalism has failed in South India". Wherever there is missionary activity and the Gospel is preached, little groups of people won for Christ band themselves together. These groups are Congregational churches, though they are affiliated to no Union, and are the result of the labours of missionaries who do not call themselves Congregationalists.

The cry for machinery and centralization is invariably a sign of weakness, while the agglomeration of various communions into a

huge organization can only lead to the emergence of new groups of Nonconformists whose life cannot be satisfied within the machine.

* * *

IN reading many of the books critical of the Church we are often reminded of Sainte-Beuve's statement about Goethe, that "he understood all the world except two kinds of men—the Christian and the hero". So many of the facile writers of the present day never seem to have met people with real religious experience, men and women whose whole lives revolve round Christ and His Church. There are thousands of people in this country to-day to whom the Christian religion is the vital thing—their work, their play, the way they make and use their money, everything is related to it—and in it they find a joy and gladness they have never been able to find elsewhere. Their experience demands consideration in any philosophy of the world which would take into account all the data. How far some of our teachers are from comprehending it may be seen from a question like Durkheim's: "What essential difference is there between an assembly of Christians celebrating the principal dates of the life of Christ, or of Jews remembering the Exodus from Egypt, and a reunion of citizens commemorating the promulgation of a new moral or legal system or some great event in the national life?"

* * *

ABOVE we have referred to the influence of the machine age on the Church and its organized life. In Dr. J. W. Buckham's new book, reviewed within, we were interested to read of an interesting experiment whereby he illustrates the dominance of scientific interests in the modern world. Taking the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, he compared the space allotted to religious and philosophical with that given to scientific and kindred subjects. Here are his results, in columns:

" Brahmanism 12, Brewing 16; Church 7 (Church History 30), Climate 33; Ethics 70, Electricity 146; Jesus Christ 22, Infinitesimal Calculus 51; Poetry 28, Plants 108; Mohammedan Religion 14, Magnetism 64; Personality 1½, Iron and Steel 68; Philosophy 10, Planarians 13; Religion 29, Reptiles 83; Sin 1, Skull 12; Soul 0, Sound 36."

We wonder if this striking disproportion, found by Dr. Buckham in the 11th edition, is to be found in the new edition. Some of our readers might try the experiment and let us know.

A REASONABLE EVANGELICALISM.

THE present unrest in religious and theological circles is not necessarily alarming. It may proceed from the exhaustion of fever or from the exuberance of healthy youth. It may be the travail pain of a new birth which heralds a brighter future. Organized religion and the creeds of the Church are being attacked in front and in flank. That is inevitable. A Kingdom not of this world must always, in this world, be a Kingdom in arms. "If", as Dr. Oman has said, "when her creed was surest, most sharply defined, least questioned, the Church had a hard struggle to gain practical acceptance against an enemy which has its most dangerous ally in man's own appetites and passions", we need hardly be surprised to-day, in a world where thought has moved with a more insurgent rapidity in the last quarter of a century than in any preceding similar period, and the social, moral, and religious life of the world has been shattered by a war of unparalleled bitterness, that the Christian position should find itself threatened.

I.—*At the moment we are faced by Two Serious Challenges.*

(a) The *first* is A Transitional Challenge, such as manifests itself at every period of changing thought.

It has been said, with some degree of exaggeration, that "most Christian people are in a state of virtual creedlessness at the present time". Certainly neither Fundamentalist nor Modernist seems disposed to nail his colours to the old credal standards. There has been a widening of the field of scientific enquiry which has brought with it a larger knowledge of the creative processes at work in the universe; a new and sympathetic interest has been aroused in the Person of Jesus; there has been a growing sense of responsibility for our fellow men and a clearer conviction that the Christian is in this world for the very practical purpose of trying to make it a better one. If this be so, it is not the first time that men have found themselves "wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born", and one cannot help feeling that it is a wandering in the right direction, out of the darkness of chaos into the light of a richer truth and a kindlier order of life.

(b) The *second* is A Psychological Challenge. Psychology, it is claimed, has discredited belief. Briefly, it is said: "If there were extra-human sources of knowledge and super-human sources of human power their existence should, it seems, have become increasingly evident. Yet the converse is apparently true. . . . In religious lives accessible to psychological investigation nothing requiring the admission of superhuman influences has been found. There is nothing—not a desire, not a feeling, not a thought, not a

vision, not an illumination—that can seriously make us look to transcendent causes”. If that contention of Leuba’s be true, then we must put up the shutters! Psychology will never put “the King’s business” into liquidation. Surely the argument is a piece of confused thinking. The very fact that a scientific account can be given of religious processes is advanced as a proof that they are invalid! Because the account which psychology gives of these processes can be made a closed and exhaustive account, it is denied that the processes in question can have any further significance. But to explain a process, however completely, is not to account for a fact. It is narrow, to the point of grotesqueness, to say that whatever is subject to natural law cannot have any reference to God, that the only evidence of God that any aspect of our experience can afford must be in the nature of a miraculous disturbance. How can you maintain that the Divine resides only in the abnormal? The fact is that the psychological sphere of discussion is not the only one in which truth operates. Leuba goes on to say that “nothing ought to be easier for the psychologist, if any such process refer to God, than to show in the life of feeling and thought, disturbances not depending on known natural causes”. On the contrary, is it not obvious that the religious significance of any such process is just one that we should not have expected psychology to detect? The psychologist analyses the mental processes of the physicist. He does not, at the conclusion of his analysis, turn to the physicist and say that as psychology can explain all these processes without reference to the ether or the electron, the objective references of the physicist’s thought to these factors are hallucinations! Psychology is one science, physics is another, and thoughts about the ether and the electron can be considered in various ways for different purposes. They can be discussed from a psychological point of view, or a physical. Neither view point is exhaustive.

Similarly, if from our religious experience we are to infer a reference to a real Divine order, it will not be by reason of any disturbance in that experience itself—which lies outside the scope of reference; it will be rather by way of an interpretation of our normal religious experience in another order than the psychological. We have had all this before in the biological controversy which raged between science and religion thirty years ago. It is a characteristic of most new sciences. With the joyous irresponsibility of inexperience they claim to have ejected religion from yet another region of life. In each case, more careful reflexion has shown that the science in question possesses an order of its own under which it can deal with the facts of its particular field of enquiry, without the aid of any theological hypothesis. When Laplace declared that he had no need of the hypothesis of God, he was actually making a statement not concerning the reality or unreality of the Divine Being, but

concerning the necessary limitations of the science of astronomy. Biology, thirty years ago, psychology to-day, have claimed rights over their own territory that we must allow, but which extend only to the limits of their particular subject matter. They administer their own province. But the claim of any science to extend its powers to the adjudication of questions of reality and value beyond its scope, is an exuberance of youth which time and experience correct. As well might the Prince of Monaco claim to rule all Europe!

Psychology is too ready to commandeer philosophy and theology, and it fails to give a receipt for what it has commandeered. Psycho-analysis will no more account for a man (how much less for God, who is no chance interpolation in man's thought, but the ground and meaning of all things) than botanical analysis will account for a flower. Because a thing is an unnecessary hypothesis for psychology, it is not necessarily an illusion. My rates and taxes are an unnecessary hypothesis for psychology: I wish to goodness that they were an illusion! The science of psychology cannot adjudicate upon ultimate truth. That is the province of philosophy. The business of psychology is with the states and processes of our mental life rather than with its fruits. It is the technician who can take to pieces and put together, though not invent, the compass by which we steer; but it cannot steer the ship across those "strange seas of thought", from whose unseen shores adventurous souls, prophet and poet, artist and thinker, bring back their rich freightage of beauty, knowledge, and experience. The claim of psychology to be the arbiter of universal reality certainly does not err on the side of modesty. To say, "What I know not is not knowledge; what I cannot explain is hallucination", is a little out of date. There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in such psychology.

But in this matter of what we believe a thinking being has no right to be a remittance man, living on what is transmitted to him from some infallible Church, or Book, or Theology. In matters of truth that only is ours that we win for ourselves. It is not unreasonable to start with certain assumptions, and to "sit down before our facts", as Huxley insisted, "like a little child", that is to say, in a spirit of awe, wonder, and reverent expectancy. Science is built on postulates; for instance, astronomy first examines the appearances of the stars, then works out the "laws" that "explain" the phenomena, and finally asks and endeavours to answer the question "What is light?". All the while it has assumed that light exists. Every study must assume something to start with, and it is found that we can best examine such assumptions at the end of our investigation, rather than at the beginning, for the whole enquiry throws light on the problems as we work them out. We have direct experience of processes, but not of the things underlying those processes. Hence we speak of the mysteries of science. Are we to isolate the science of theology and

allow to it no assumptions, no mysteries when it involves the greatest mysteries of all—the nature of God and the nature of man, and these two natures in relations of hostility and fellowship?

II.—*The Starting-Point of Religion.*

Otto has suggested by his theory of the *numinous* that man begins his primitive experience of religion with a sense of the holy. He apprehends the *mysterium tremendum*—the Divine, "by emotions of fascination and awe, which are non-rational, and indeed prior to the reasoning powers of the soul". This "holy", which is the irreducible minimum of religious experience, is not the absolutely good. It is the awe-inspiring, the uncanny.

White blaze—
A tree's head snaps—and there, there, there, there, there,
His thunder follows! Fool to gibe at Him!

The sense of the holy is as fundamental to religion as the sense of beauty is to aesthetics. The feeling of dependence is the first element in worship, marking it out as an unique experience. So Abraham, pleading for Sodom, prays: "Behold I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who am but dust and ashes". It is an overwhelming sense of nothingness. Man is conscious of a sense of reality—he has a feeling of a real objective presence. This perception of "something there" is the deepest and most widespread fact in primitive man's experience. This sense of awe, of the uncanny, is the starting-point of all subsequent religious development.

If the gods were, as some current psychology and animistic theories of religion claim, merely primitive man's attempt to explain the inexplicable happenings of his world, and the counterpart of his natural fears of those happenings, surely such idea of the Divine as he had would have passed away with the resolution of those fears and the natural explanation of those strange phenomena which civilization has brought in its train. Instead of that, this element of awe is gradually refined into the loftiest worship expressing itself in the Christian ascription: "Holy, holy, holy Lord God Almighty".

If the mysterious be merely the inexplicable, then religion based upon it would, with increasing knowledge and natural explanations based on such knowledge, have passed away. Religious experience is a gift of grace rather than an achievement of our moral effort. "Salvation is of the Lord." Even as Alfred de Musset says of his poems: "It is not work, it is listening. It is as if some unknown person were speaking in your ear". Let religion lose its belief that it is in touch with a Divine objective reality and it will disappear. It is a recklessly bold step that would dissipate a universal manifestation of human life into hallucination and self-deception. Religion is not a by-product of the development of human experience. It is one of the main influences that have made that experience what it is

at its best. This fact seems to tell fatally against any theory of "Religion without Revelation", which, even under the alluring advocacy of Mr. Julian Huxley, leaves us in the air, and becomes Religion without Inspiration. Primitive man sought to safeguard himself against the unknown powers around him by two assumptions. He believed that he could control those powers by magic, and that he could conciliate them. The latter postulate has very slowly gained ground as faith in God. Deeper than all forms of magic and pessimism is this common assumption, that the superhuman order is approachable and that a friendly relation can be established with it. "The universe responds to man's search for what is good." The postulate of magic is represented to-day by the dregs of superstition. The postulate of religion has steadily carried man forward to richer conceptions of God and good.

Science and philosophy assume the trustworthiness of experience. Religious experience knows God in a way analogous to that by which, in social experience, we know our friends—by personal relations. Human life would be unendurable if the assumption of religion that human goodness has its place in ultimate reality were false. The testimony of religion is as near to being world-wide witness as anything can be. Who can estimate the influence of Christianity in the re-enforcement and maintenance of morality? It takes the moral ideal and makes it "alive unto God", so that "through faith men work righteousness", and we may say, without exaggeration, that Jesus Christ is not only the highest revelation of the Divine in man's spiritual history, but also the unchallengeable moral leader of the race. The faith of which He is the fountain and inspiration is the source of the highest ideals, aspirations, and devotion in the world. Everything lives whither that river comes. If this be so, it follows that

III.—*Theology has its Task.*

Systems of dogma are landmarks. The Athanasian Creed, for instance, is not a permanent standard of Christian thought for all time, but for once upon a time. It indicates the way by which Christian thought has come. We do not jettison the past in theology any more than in science or philosophy. We build upon it.

The beginning of Theology, like the Biblical account of Creation, is

(a) *God.*

It is a legitimate philosophy which postulates an ultimate intelligence at the back of all things and regards the universe as permeated by a Life Force such as Bergson suggests in *Creative Evolution*. If we combine this ultimate intelligence and this creative will working through all things, we have a combination which brings us to "the verge of that splendid concrete vision of the Hebrew prophets—a living God". It is not only religiously inspiring, but

intellectually it is the least inadequate explanation to think of the power behind the universe as personal.

Mr. Kipling has drawn for us a suggestive picture of a little boy sitting bare-legged in Lucknow Station, entirely regardless of all the traffic and flurry round about him, pondering to himself: "What is Kim?". Let a Western mind do that and the thinker will find that his final introspection brings him to the conclusion not only that he is a personality, but also that he is "fearfully and wonderfully made". What then of God, the creative spirit of all life? Can we deny personality here? When we speak of what is below our human level, of our dog, for instance, we speak of it as though it were a person. We cannot speak of that which is above our human level as less than a person. Our own experience of the inner quality of life may, with reason, be used to interpret the quality of the universal life. Men will never be satisfied with a merely rationalistic "stream of tendency", or a happy-go-lucky "something-not-ourselves which makes for righteousness". We are told that the scientific study of material facts does not suggest personality in God. Of course it does not and cannot. You cannot get a personal God out of material facts any more than you can get blood out of a stone. It is not quantity that counts but quality. Immeasurable aeons may be behind us and may be ahead of us, but in such a connexion

What's time? Leave now for dogs and apes!
Man has Forever!

The essence of personality and of its inward life does not consist, as reality never can do, in mere quantity, whether of mass or of moments, but in quality. It is therefore nearer to the truth to speak of that Ultimate Power that is through all and over all and behind all as the "Lord God Almighty" than merely as the Absolute.

It was not the least glory of Jesus that He won the Jewish mind from the contemplation of the merely vast and remote to the contemplation of the interior and spiritual; to the glory of personality. By His words, "Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name", He invested that personality with the character of holy love. God is man's Father and so truly man's Father that He "cannot away with" man's sin, because love at its highest is never content until the object of its affections is perfect. In proof of this we are faced by a challenging fact. That He might awaken our sense of the knowledge and love of our Heavenly Father, Jesus points to a sparrow fallen upon the ground—a dark picture of the tragic side of existence. Surely the argument of a madman! "Do not fear, the Father who let that sparrow fall on the ground is your Father." How inconclusive! And yet faith, built on such an unpromisingly paradoxical foundation, does make men strong to do and patient to bear and unconquerably hopeful. We do not know why pain and sorrow are, but somehow we feel sure that it is not because God does

not know, does not care, or is incompetent. Strong faith is not bred, born, and brought up on the sunny side of the street of some shallow optimistic theory of life. The faith that wins through, that holds fast to the Fatherly love of God, has most often and most passionately been aroused in men who have stood within the shadow of the world's darkest tragedy—the suffering and death of Christ upon the Cross.

If the ultimate reality be intelligent, purposeful personality, any manifestation that it may make of itself will be qualitative rather than quantitative. Mere higness could only reveal itself by manifesting itself in its entirety. But where the chief characteristic is quality, any part, great or small, reveals the whole. Further, if the ultimate reality be holy love as well as intelligent, purposeful personality, that holy love must find expression in such form as the object of its affection can recognize and receive. So that, God being holy love, the Incarnation was not only possible, but inevitable; and, quality rather than quantity being the characteristic of the Divine nature, it was possible for Him so to reveal Himself within the narrow limits of a human form that it could be said of Jesus that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily". Hence

(b) *The Word was made Flesh.*

The universe in which we live reveals progress and purpose. "Nothing walks with aimless feet." It moves forward from inorganic matter to the product of moral personality. The spirit of all life is ever finding ways of self-expression. It is in man, as a spiritual being, striving after character and the fellowship of love, that God is most clearly seen. There is a spiritual plan being carried out here. It is concerned with the formation of character. If God be like Jesus, then the life of Jesus provides the pattern for our living. The challenge of Christ, "Whom say ye that I am?", is a permanent challenge. It meets us as it meets every age. The answer to His question, while remaining incomplete, becomes ever fuller, richer, more wonderful.

Begin with Jesus as we see Him and know Him in experience. It is a mistake to make our first approach by way of some theory of the Virgin Birth, or the Atonement, or the miraculous. We do not so approach our friends. The meaning of Jesus grows on us not by weight of argument and the dim light of theories, but in personal and revealing intercourse. Jesus is not a theological mannequin upon whom we may show off our latest thinly-spun creations of rationalistic and humanitarian speculation. He is that which is there when we reach our soul's deepest yearnings, when we face our soul's direst need.

In these days of hurried thinking and *laissez-faire* morality, we lose sight of the "ultimate liability of the human soul" to righteousness and God. It is there, the spur of conscience, the reason behind

those strange feelings of self-contempt and disgust with the world, which keep us restless. Life, with its camouflage and compromises, its sordid ambitions and petty motives, its dark passions and ruthless selfishness, suddenly brings us up against the final morality—Jesus Christ.

Bernard Shaw's Blanco Posnet stole a horse. A woman, with a little child desperately ill, begged the loan of it in order to get a doctor. She rides off to save her child. He is caught. He says to the sheriff and jury :

There's two games being played. One game's a rotten game that makes me feel I am dirt and that you're all rotten dirt as me. T'other game may be a silly game, but it isn't rotten. I played the rotten game, but the great game was played on me; and now I'm for the great game every time. When I think that I might have been safe and fifty miles away by now with that horse; and here I am waiting to be hung up and filled with lead. What came to me? What made me such a fool? That's what I want to know. That's the great secret.

Yes,

The love of Jesus, what it is
None but His loved ones know,

but Blanco Posnet was in a fair way of knowing it then.

"The great game"! Just another name for Jesus Christ. If I am to choose for my working life a definition—an answer to Christ's question, "Whom say ye that I am?", then, with utmost reverence I would reply "the great game", rather than the definition of the Athanasian Creed which leaves the mind bewildered and the heart cold.

A man finds himself at some turn of the road unexpectedly face to face with a cleanness, not of whited sepulchre or whitewashed saintliness, but of sincerity, of openness, of a great simplicity—a child-like spirit that makes him, too, long for a clean heart and a right spirit, for "life that is life indeed". An experience like Blanco Posnet's brings one nearer to the heart of reality than all definitions. It is simplicity itself; but a profound simplicity, as when one comes out of the silent gloom of a trackless pine forest and looks into the clear depths of an Alpine lake, lit by the morning sun, or gazes into the eyes of a little child. There is a tyranny about the living Christ that compels a man's conscience and heart to stand and deliver, try and evade Him how we will. Ibsen, that Christ-haunted man, realized it when he declared: "If you have once been in His hands you can never be a free man again".

The vital fact in religion is this experience of the living, life-giving Christ. But that experience is only possible because the historic Jesus lived and worked, taught and suffered and died and rose again from the grave. There is a great continuity. "Salvation is of the Jews", and Jesus is the climax of that evolutionary process in religion which Judaism clearly reveals. • Being the climax, He

abides for ever to challenge each generation afresh with His "Whom say ye that I am?"

The Christian claims that Christ is the Head of the Church which is His body, but he claims also, something much bigger—he claims Christ as his personal Saviour and Friend. His faith is incomparably more than loyalty to or trust in a society, such as is Buddhism or Islam. It is trust in and loyalty to an unseen yet historic and living person, Jesus Christ. Now a faith that gives itself so completely to an unseen person has no parallel in the history of religion. "The faith that Christians have in Jesus is a faith only proper to God."

Further; to the early Christians, Jesus was more than the Saviour of a series of individuals. He was Head of a new society which was to include all men. The religious man of "every clime and coast" is a man who, knowing something about God, wants to know more. He has had many teachers, and of them all One alone is unexhausted. The most devoted Buddhist hopes for another and better Buddha. The most fanatical Mohammedan looks for a Mahdi who will outshine the founder of his religion. Even the Jew longs for a Messiah, who will fulfil the Old Testament and go beyond it. The Christian, from the beginning, has looked upon Christ as "the final and sufficient revelation of God". Whatever wider knowledge there is to come to us about God will come through Christ. The New Testament writers, with their great phrases about Christ, believed that knowing what Christ was they knew what God was and knew it in an unsurpassable way. "The Word was made flesh"; "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself", that is, bringing men into a renewed fellowship, for reconciliation means renewal of fellowship. How completely such claims harmonized with the general Christian experience is shown, incidentally, by the nature of the first heresy—Doketism. It was the first attempt to solve the problem how a single person can be both man and God. It appeared within eighty years of our Lord's death, and reveals the interesting fact that the early Christian, because of his intimate experience of the living Christ, was more sure that He was God even than that He was man. The cumulative experience of many generations of Christians expresses itself in the ultimate conviction, *Christ is Lord*. There is no parallel to the Lordship of Jesus but the Lordship of God.

What is such a touching confession as that of Ibsen's but an unsolicited declaration that Christ is God, for no *man* has the right to hold in bondage his fellow man!

(c) *The Central Fact of the Christian Evangel is the Cross.*

In such a world as this, perfect Sonship of God means conflict, conflict with what contradicts it in the heart of man, conflict with what challenges and threatens to set it aside in the natural order. The conflict in its final issue was not with evil in its most depraved

form, but with the world at its best. Judaism, the purest of all non-Christian religions, crucified Him. Rome, the greatest and most tolerant of the ancient States, assented.

Closely associated with the crucifixion is the word *atonement*. Thousands of years of ritual sacrifice inevitably shaped men's language and provided them with metaphors which they refined and spiritualized. We can share the experience of reconciliation, which is what atonement means, even though such metaphors do not come naturally to us, but we must re-state the fact for ourselves, remembering the inadequacy of human words and thoughts for such a purpose. What is *our* experience of the Cross, as far as it goes? Not what is some eminent scholar's theory or explanation. What does the Cross do for me? What do I think and feel about it? We cannot express the meaning of the Cross in the great words of a Paul. It would be artificial if we did. But we can ponder it, until we find it wonderful beyond words, and become conscious that in a unique way God is there.

This, at any rate, the Cross does for us. It intensifies Jesus and evil. It brings things to a creative crisis. Something is born in us which was not there before—there is a new creation, a new response, a quickened power to see and understand and love. The rotten game is seen to be rotten. We see the great game being silently played, and presently we see that it is more than a great game. It is a fight to a finish. The very silence becomes charged with significance. "He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so He openeth not His mouth." A picture of silent helplessness! But has not such suffering in child victim and branded slave ever been one of the most morally creative and redemptively effective forces? *Uncle Tom's Cabin* roused the conscience of a continent and with its mute appeal shattered the hellish traffic in human beings. In so far as the Cross is an eternal drama revealing the eternal reaction against evil which is at the heart of the universe, our feeling is intensified against those forms of evil in our own day which are in the line of succession of those forces that crucified Christ. But can we escape the conviction that our sin crucified Him? Who of us would have been of those who cried, "Crucify Him!"? Yet there came that stark moment when He stood in isolation, on one side, and on the other, men and women with ordinary standards of morality and religion. By that in us "which is akin to the world's want of faith and lack of love, we are against Him".

As we stand beholding, the stillness of Jesus begins to lay us under its spell. Why does He not fight back? But if this be fighting? What if, all the time, this lamb in the hands of the shearers is really on the throne of the universe? Can it be otherwise if the universe be moral? What if this is, like the other forces of the universe, noiseless and the mightiest of them all? What if it speak

of a power at the heart of the life and death of Christ which cannot be put into word or symbol? So that in that flash of insight, when the rational and spiritual activities are functioning on the highest plane, we see what Jesus was always seeking to tell our deaf ears and show our blinded eyes—what if this be God! God “reconciling the world unto Himself while we were yet sinners”, and at the same time revealing to us by a silence infinitely more arresting and eloquent than any argument or audible denunciation that “the wages of sin is death”, because sin is essentially a thing against which an annihilating sentence of God lies: revealing to us, that “the reaction against evil”, as Denney has put it in one of his tremendous phrases, “is persistent, inexorable, absolute; when it goes on to the end, this is the end”.

Jesus did not wipe out sin on the Cross. He broke its power, even as the Allies broke the power of the Germans at the Marne. They still were able to inflict loss and injury and suffering, but from that time on they had lost the War and were fighting to delay the final capitulation. Calvary was the battle-front where evil matched itself in supreme conflict with good and lost.

We have come a long way from the bare idea of the primitive, awful, holy, but if this be true it has been a pilgrimage of grace, that brings us past magic, superstition, and altars heaped high with animal sacrifices, and leaving them behind, leads us to the foot of the Cross, where we find that which without reservation we can worship and love as God. Is there any truth that can so change our nature or charge our life with new hope and abiding joy as does this? Reconciliation is a universal and ultimate need. The loftier our conception of God, the more sadly and clearly are we conscious of the fact that whatever His attitude towards man, sin is something which is absolutely and finally repelled by Him. We could not begin to think of the world as the sphere of moral government, education, and judgment, if it were not repelled. It is true that the Gospels say much less about the punishment of sin than about its forgiveness. That probably is because “sin is not what the Pharisees among us happen to disapprove”. To sin is to get wrong with man and with God and with the fellowship. Punishment cannot put sin right. You may “make the punishment fit the crime”, but sin is got rid of by patience and love rather than by anger and punishment. “Neither do I condemn thee.” But she knew that He condemned her sin, and cared for her to the point of completely jeopardizing Himself socially and legally.

The New Testament does not tell us, with any elaboration, the way in which the death of Christ frees man from sin. That omission does not necessarily invalidate the fact. The experience and the gospel of the early Christians were summarized in two words: “Christ crucified”. They had a Saviour which was Christ the

Lord. That was their positive gospel. It is left to each age to enrich the fact of the atonement by an increasingly full definition which it adds to all preceding definitions. Have we not to-day in the theory of sublimation a suggestive line of interpretation? Is it fanciful to see in our Lord's own words a foreshadowing of it? "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The watered milk of a gospel of humanitarianism is a poor substitute for "the blood of the Lamb", interpreting the word blood as does Ignatius, in his haunting phrase, "His blood which is immortal love". The death of Christ, which is the fullest and highest manifestation of love and the complete handing over of love to the human heart, takes our God-created instincts and passions, our natural endowments and appetites and sublimates them, *i.e.*, breaks through all our differences and hostilities and brings our hearts up and back to God. That potent love raises all in us to the highest possible achievement, where we allow it to have its way, so that the sex impulse becomes a passion to serve others rather than to indulge self, the fighting instinct becomes a passion to save others rather than to destroy them; and the weak, sinful, fearful soul, beholding the glory of immortal love, yields itself to the Great Sin-bearer and "is changed into the same image from glory to glory". Even Saul Kane, lecherous, drunken, pugnacious, through "the Everlasting Mercy" finds that

The bolted door had broken in,
I knew that I had done with sin:
I knew that Christ had given me birth
To brother all the souls on earth.

To be lifted from the old self into a self transformed by the renewing and revitalizing of mind and heart, is the true re-birth from above, and that is the transmutation that the recreating love of Christ achieves. It is an elevation at the hand of the King of kings to the moral and spiritual peerage of the children of God.

Let us hold fast to that great word *Propitiation*. Words change their meaning. We do not give the same meaning to the term "Lord Chancellor" that our ancestors did: he no longer keeps the King's door. By the time of the second Temple the idea that propitiation meant the softening of the anger of Deity had given place to that of annulling separation. To-day, the solemn ritual of the Day of Atonement expresses to a pious Jew a longing for the removal of all alienation, of all hindrances to the intercourse of spirit with spirit. The New Testament Christian found that Jesus Christ was more completely one with him on the Cross even than in the Incarnation. Through the Incarnation our Lord was one with man. In the crucifixion He was one with sinful man.

You may get rid of bulls and goats and all the varied paraphernalia of sacrifice, but you do not get rid of sin, you do not eliminate sacrifice. If, collectively, the body of Christ to-day would

live as He lived, live vicariously, as love always does at its highest, we should witness some of the "greater things" that He predicted. The Church would take away the sin of the world out of politics and industry, and the social order, out of the institutions, the thoughts, the hearts of men. Courage, faith, devoted love on the part of Christian men and women working in unison would mean the Kingdom of Heaven on earth.

This great idea of vicariousness has the value of being both positive and redemptive. It substitutes a true, though costly, idealism for the flatulent ethics of the demagogue, with his ready-made millennium. Sin is the problem! Love is the only solution! There must be mystery in such a theme as man's sin and God's redeeming love. To say that in His death on the Cross He entered into complete fellowship with sin-stricken men and therefore they can enter into saving fellowship with Him and so escape sin and enter once again into fellowship with God, is difficult to explain. But in view of all the facts of history and experience, it is more difficult to explain away. And such fellowship has produced the profoundest moral and spiritual changes, and the finest characters, and issued in the noblest institutions. The tree is known by its fruits.

To say that man is "heir of all the ages" is but to proclaim vicariousness from the housetops. It is to insist on the fact that incalculable things have been done for us by heroic love that we could not have done for ourselves. The Christian Church got firm hold upon the fact that Christ died for all men to bring them to God. It saw the societary implications of that fact and drew its inspiration from and based its hope for the Kingdom upon it. Deny the vicarious element in the Cross and you deny the deepest facts of racial existence, motherhood and fatherhood.

Were I drowned in the deepest sea,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine,
I know whose tears would come down to me,
Mother o' mine, O mother o' mine.

Does that strike a true note or a false?

The vicarious permeates life. Why exclude it from the Cross? Why not see at Calvary its culmination? The profoundest of all mysteries is the atonement, that act of reconciliation wherein the three greatest mysteries of all time blend in one—the mystery of man, the mystery of sin, and the mystery of God. Would you save another from spiritual ill, you must go down in understanding fellowship to his level whom you seek to save, and yet not go down under. The Christian doctrine of salvation is psychologically tenable. Where we are dealing with men and women the only way by which a nobler soul can lift a meaner, a better man save a worse, is to seek and to win his fellowship in such a way as to become like him and yet remain different from him. Christ's servant must enter

into and pass through his comrade's experience, often feeling the pain and shame of it more poignantly than he, in order that, in turn, the one who is saved may share the experience of the one who, under God, has saved him. Salvation is a matter of mutual experience. Salvation by fellowship demands the consent of both parties, if it is to be an accomplished fact.

O Lamb of God, I come.

The Death of Christ leads on to the Resurrection of Christ, without which the Cross must have remained the darkest of all tragedies. The Resurrection was the beginning of a new life in Christ that has produced these unique facts the Christian religion, the Christian Church, the Christian civilization (at which wise men will not sneer), and the Christian character. It has still to produce the Christian State. The plastic condition of the post-war world brings this within the bounds of possibility as never before. The *motif* of the New Testament is the broadcasting of a new and glorious Evangel. Conversion is not merely the turning away from a dead past, but the turning towards a life of service for others, with the risen, living, indwelling Christ as our ideal and inspiring motive power. "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." It is here, so far, that we have failed. Jesus is committed to a world-wide campaign of social and international service. If it seem a beautiful, but wholly impracticable dream, let us remember that the living God is in our midst, waiting to reveal Himself in power and great glory to and through sensitive and trustful souls, enabling them to do all they are called upon to do, through Christ. The man after His own heart is he that heareth His sayings and doeth them. We cannot help witnessing for good or evil, because personality is a diffusive force. The time is ripe for a new call to witness. It will not be sounded in exactly the same terms or tones as those of any previous age, though "the love of Christ constraineth me," will be its keynote. It will seek to apply the living, redeeming, reconciling, sublimating power of Divine love to world peace and world intercourse; to work and recreation, which latter threatens to become a bigger problem even than labour; to sex and art; to economics, industry and politics.

And we must still make good our teaching
By living, not alone by preaching.

One of the surest ways of saving one's own faith is to fight against unrighteousness incorporated in custom, habit, and institution. But all these problems are so vital that one dare not begin to deal with them until one is assured that any scheme of reconstruction will seek and find for itself an adequate and permanent foundation. Life and work are ultimately governed and judged by the background of the eternal. Without this cosmic background, without the moral,

religious, and spiritual reality which alone gives permanent value to life, our political citizenship, our industrial citizenship, our whole social life are, in the final issue, without meaning.

A practical ideal such as Christ calls us to requires a logical reason for its existence, a moral basis for its foundation, a spiritual inspiration for its continuity and realization. Reconstruct society on any lesser foundation than God (and God as revealed to us in and by the living Christ), and however fair and substantial it may appear, some blind Samson of revolt, corruption, or despair, will fling the pillars of society into the dust and bring your laboriously built structure tumbling about your heads. After 2,000 years of experimenting, with the Land of Promise still a land of "far-distances," we face our problems with the conviction that their solution can come only through the application of the principles of the Kingdom of Heaven to our earthly needs, for

The acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it.

A. E. SNASHALL.

THE SOUL OF A MINISTRY.

What I want to write about is that quality of an inner life which is the background of a true ministry. Without that background it matters little what is put in the foreground. There will be no mystery. All really good work has this touch of mystery; this element which I have ventured to call by the old Platonic name of soul. Lord Hewart was speaking the other day about Oratory, and he said that we know at once the difference between great oratory, such as that of the past, and what we have now; just as without being experts in rowing we can see that the boat at the head of the river is better than the one that comes in last. I suppose great oarsmen are like great orators, born and not made; they have the rhythm of the oars beating in the blood. There is a kind of soul in the thing. And in much the same way we know good ministries when we see them. Whether Plato's definition of a philosopher is right or not, that he is a man "able to apprehend the eternal and immutable", the definition is certainly an outline in the rough of a true ministry. Such ministries are at home with the unseen. Latimer, Jeremy Taylor, George Whitefield, will stand out in any age, because they speak to what is permanent and primeval in us. Very largely it is a question of soul.

Dean Church once defended the ministry against the common charge that it is a poor calling for a man; he said that it is poor if we make it poor, but it is what we make it, and as high as we make it; and it is the highest of all if we care to make it so. This is akin to Matthew Arnold's well-known saying that if we are to gain the full benefit of poetry we must have the real estimate of it. A great painter made the answer that he mixed his colours with brains; but he cannot have meant Herbert Spencer's brains, he must have meant Michelangelo's. And there is this bond of similarity between poetry, art, and a true ministry—that the real estimate of them takes very great count of imagination and vision.

To see this let me take you back for a moment to the eighteenth century, the age of classical English poetry, and also of Bishop Hoadly. Listen to this from Pope's *Essay on Man* :—

He who through vast immensity can pierce,
See worlds on worlds compose one universe,
Observe how system into system runs,
What other planets circle other suns,
What varied being peoples every star,
May tell why heaven has made us what we are.

It sounds like the Chairman's Address in the Physics Section of the British Association. The difference between that, and, say, Browning's,

Just when we are safest, there's a sunset touch,
 A fancy from a flower-bell, some one's death,
 A chorus-ending from Euripides;

the difference is exactly the difference between one of Bishop Hoadly's famous latitudinarian sermons, and the heart-break of Newman's "Parting of Friends". The one is cold, clever, intellectual; the other is warm, human, perceptive. It is a matter of soul.

In the eighteenth century the Puritan vision had become dim, and Dissenter and Anglican buried their animosities in a wild dread of "enthusiasm", and in a love of what we now call a dry light. It was very dry. But, just as Crabbe, and later Coleridge and Wordsworth, the one by his *Tales*, and the other two by their *Lyrical Ballads*, brought a new and deeper note, a nature note, into our literature; so did George Whitefield, and John Wesley, and Fletcher of Madeley, bring into religion a stirring of new life; and it was almost like a resurrection. Much of the early story of that movement belongs to the West Midlands; a little of it to Oxford, but more of it to Bristol and Gloucester, to the Cotswold hills, and to Staffordshire and Shropshire. The origin of the movement shews what personal influence can do in religion: Romaine, Berridge, Grimshaw of Haworth, Venn of Huddersfield, were not men who are thought to count in the world. Cowper is almost the only name of real literary distinction in the whole group; Wesley is the only man of outstanding genius; and though Whitefield is the most amazing popular orator the English pulpit has seen, his preaching was of the sort that made the Chancellor of Bristol shut all the church doors against him. These men owed nothing to birth, very nearly nothing to the Universities, and almost everything to something that had flashed in the soul, like the event of that far-off day on the Damascus road.

But the movement had some amount of preparation or literary background in a number of books: indirectly in the *Analogy* of Bishop Butler, but more obviously in books like Doddridge's *Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul*, and William Law's *Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life*. Doddridge was an Independent minister, one of those unfortunates against whom the Universities were then fast shut. William Law was an Anglican; a scholar, a Cambridge man, of Emmanuel College. Doddridge's book is useful, but the *Serious Call* is a tremendous book. Once, when Hurrell Froude and some friends were at Fairford, Keble overheard Froude say that the *Serious Call* was a pretty book: when they were separating, Keble came up to Froude and said, "I heard you say that Law's *Serious Call* is a pretty book, or some such word; it sounded to me as if you had said that the Judgment Day will be a pretty sight." The *Serious Call* is indeed tremendous; and it had great influence not only over the Evangelical Revival, but in the next century on the Tractarians. I am afraid the romantic figure who

left the English Church from Littlemore, in 1845, has stolen away our hearts, and dimmed our interest in the Evangelical Revival, and has made us think too lightly of it; but whatever may have been its infelicities to men of taste, and whatever its theological crudeness; whatever it lost from being so early separated from those centres of illumination, our college common-rooms, and from being, as it was at the first, almost entirely a movement among weavers and colliers—until the Countess of Huntingdon made one end of it aristocratic; whatever be its faults, the Evangelical Revival has had no compeer since for its total influence on the nation's life; it sought men out in their familiar needs, in their miseries, in their spiritual aspirations; and it spoke to them, not in the language of the *Essay on Man*, but in a language which was understood. It dealt face to face with the enormous fact of the eternal: "How can I help weeping," said Whitefield, himself in a passion of tears, "How can I help weeping, when you have not wept for yourselves?"—and the tears ran down the black, collier faces. The things that happened in Gwennap Pit, in Moorfields, and by the mines of Kingswood, are a sign to all who can see. The more we look at the movement, the more we shall find that its source was a profound inner life.

I have taken the eighteenth century revival as an illustration because its worth was made manifest in spite of so many disadvantages; and because I sometimes feel we are inclined to disparage that revival, and to undervalue its grave witness to the power of an inner life. But I have taken it only as an illustration, and not as an ideal. If now we take a wider field, such as the best devotional literature which has come down to us—and we have a very complete devotional literature, and some of it justly to be spoken of as classical—we shall find in all that literature the same note of the supremacy of an inner life. I will say nothing about books like *The Imitation of Christ*, or the *Theologia Germanica*; let us keep nearer the ground.

There is, for instance, George Herbert's *Priest to the Temple*. Izaak Walton said of Herbert that when his saint's-bell rung to prayers, the ploughmen in the fields would let their plough rest that they also might offer their devotions to God along with him, and then they would return to their plough. That three years' ministry in the village rectory of Bemerton, by Salisbury, still lives; and you see why when you read Walton's *Life of Herbert*. It is in the *Priest to the Temple* that Herbert says of the country parson that his pulpit is his joy and his throne; but the character of his sermon, he says, is holiness—"he is not witty, or learned, or eloquent, but holy." That is Herbert. Now let us hear Richard Baxter in his *Self-Review*; a man of much vaster mind than Herbert, and in the thick of world affairs. He is speaking of the spiritual world as having now become dominant in him; and he traces this effect to, among other things,

(1) God's transcendent greatness *with whom it is that he has most to do*; a very noticeable phrase; and (2) to the sense of the nearness of eternity. Newman, speaking to his brethren of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, says that he begs for them this privilege, "that they should never be known by the public world, either for praise, or for blame . . . but that they should send many souls to Heaven . . . and should work for God alone . . . and make Him their sole hope, and His eternal heaven their sole aim." And Dean Church, the other of Oriël's two greatest sons, thus spoke to the Ordinands at St. Paul's: "You and I," he says, "must learn to look below the surface . . . whatever we do, we must not part with that inner sacred life of the soul, which lives within to things not seen, to Christ, and truth, and immortality."

But we have more than a literature to turn back to. We have been unfortunate indeed if we have not known during our own lives one or two ministries that stood apart; ministries that had on them the light of another world, and bore its aspect. Soon after I began work I had the good fortune to be for some years in close touch with Dr. Mackennal. Dr. Selbie will not remember it, but when he was editor of *The Examiner* I wrote for him the obituary article on Dr. Mackennal's death. That is twenty-five years ago. Looking back I can see what Mackennal's influence was upon me, just when a man needs more than the purely intellectual influences, and needs most of all a spiritual guide where the intellectual tracks are only faint. Mackennal was a man of the widest culture, a lineal successor of Baxter and John Howe. Some were afraid of him; but in reality he had the tenderness and simplicity of a little child, and along lines of his own he was a wonderful pastor. His photograph hangs on my study wall at home, and when I am going to say anything particularly crude or wild, I see him look up off his paper. There is much to be said for having a guardian angel.

I need only mention to convey to you what I mean the name of Arnold Thomas of Bristol. What was the secret of his unfailing charm? There was one thing some of us down in the West observed about the Congregational Union in those days. They had perhaps a score of men who could be relied on to swing the Assembly over on public questions, and there was no dearth of able minds to handle the changes of thought; but if the Union wanted the deepest notes struck, and to be carried into the heart of ultimate spiritual mysteries, it would send for Arnold Thomas. I cannot explain it to you, except it be that, in Borrow's beautiful phrase, he knew about "the wind on the heath."

If you will forgive me the nearness of the reference, there was another ministry I knew more at first hand than either of these. He was a man hardly heard of outside his own city, where he laboured for fifty years. You might have cornered him in five minutes in

academic debate, though I am not quite sure about that ; but if you had gone with him, as I sometimes went, among the sick, among the troubled and heart-broken, it would have opened upon you another world, and you would have wondered, and wondered again, how it was done. That man was my own father : he had more than a touch of pastoral genius, and his life will always stand to me for the soul of a ministry.

It is not easy for any of us to reach marks like these, and I am sure you will not interpret what I am saying as assuming attainments in myself. In nothing do we need to weigh our words more than in speaking of the inner life, for in nothing are we so liable to profess more than we can make good. There are so many difficulties ; and these difficulties arise from so many sources ; partly from our environment, partly from the nature of our work, but perhaps chiefly from within ourselves. About environment ; I believe we can give it an importance and force it does not possess. George Herbert says somewhere that though the fishes live in the sea they are not salt. We need to beware of the catch-words of an unsifted science. Environment is one of those Mesopotamian words which we use and think we have explained something. Environment does tell upon us, but not more perhaps than we tell on our environment. Who was it said, " L'état, c'est moi ! " ? It is not untrue to say, " I am my environment " ; I take it with me wherever I go, and I make it, quite as much as it makes me. The final question is about ourselves. So too about our work. No doubt the nature of our work brings many difficulties ; and not the least that so many of our people have a very imperfect notion of what a ministry is, and much of our time is frittered away in things which are not the stuff a man's life is made of. But even so, and allowing for it all, things turn at last on what we ourselves intend.

Thus we come at last (whichever way we take) to the question to which Baxter gives the longest chapter in his *Reformed Pastor*, the question of " a minister's care of himself." At all costs we must get rid of intellectual slovenliness in dealing with Christian experience. We must give ourselves time to live within. Strength and naturalness in speaking of spiritual things rest on an inner life which has no frayed edges of unreality, nothing that gives the impression of makeshift. This means self-discipline. It means daily concentration. It means effort ; the prayer of quiet ; not day-dreaming, but meditation. I am coming to the conclusion that some ministers read too much. A friend of mine once startled a very intellectual fraternal with the question, " But when do you think ? ". I believe we need to get alone more ; not too much, but more than we do. Take the path over the moor. I had tea once in the Prior's parlour of the old Llanthony Abbey ; it was not much of a room, but the window looked out up a great valley with a clear stream running

down it ; and the valley ended in a high mountain ridge, and over the ridge there came the procession of the clouds. I am for having a Prior's parlour in our lives. Lift up your eyes unto the hills from whence cometh your help. Love the mystics. There is a mystic note in life, if we do but listen-in for it. Why else did the old Laird of Lothian lift his hat whenever he passed the site of the cottage where Samuel Rutherford was born? Says Edward Burrough, " And so we ceased from the teachings of men and their words . . . and we waited upon the Lord . . . and while waiting in silence as we often did . . . we received often the downpouring of the Spirit upon us, and we spake as the Lord gave us utterance, and as His Spirit led us."

It is this note of spiritual quickness and sensitiveness that seems to be missing in so much that is modern. Prospero has broken his staff, and buried it in the earth. But it may be that I am wrong. At any rate I want you not to misunderstand me. I will not give up one least bit of our hard-won freedom. Like the rest of you, I see the need there is to put our creeds in more believable forms. I do not want to go back. All my life I have loved science, and I am not going to pretend now that I do not see its meanings. But there is something else ; something deeper in, farther back, more lasting ; and without this something else we shall never

. . . unlock
The clasping charm, and thaw the numbing spell.

When Pius X was trying to restore the Gregorian Chant to the worship of his Church, he said he wished the prayer of his people to rest on the beautiful. More and more our own work must rest on the beautiful : on that perfect beauty which is holiness ; on that durable treasure of the inner life which outstrips all praise, and is more precious than rubies, and better than fine gold.

A. T. S. JAMES.

DOGMA AND ITS VALUE IN PREACHING.

THERE is attached to the wall in a certain thoroughfare a small signboard advertising a neighbouring Adult School. At the foot of it is displayed the phrase: "No Politics, No Class, No Creed!" One has sometimes wondered in what way men may be supposed to be attracted by these words. This curious list of negations is assumed to be a recommendation. "No Politics . . . No Creed"; we stand for nothing at all, there is nothing to believe! One is inclined to say: "When you have found something worth holding to, and standing for, then put it up on your board. But do not advertise the emptiness of your position." There are some Churches and ministers who seem to find equal delight in the boast that they have no Creed, that they offer to the seeker nothing that he need believe!

Dogmatic teaching is singularly out of favour. Outside the Church, among its critics, the word dogma is almost a term of contempt. Anti-religious writers in the newspapers describe religion with this word, and feel that it is sufficiently condemned, though they are frequently as ignorant of its meaning as they are contemptuous. But within religious circles also, dogma is not in favour. Most young preachers regard it with suspicion, and set out to establish a religion of experience. Since Schleiermacher, this latter has been the note of theology, it is the current fashion of religious thought. Doubtless it has done much to justify itself, in spite of the fact that the religion of experience lies always under the threatening shadow of subjectivism.

The Protestant Churches have always laid great stress on individualistic and experiential religion; their life has in some cases been sustained on personal "experiences", narrated for the edification of the group. This has the merit of making religion seem vivid and real. So urgent has appeared the need of this that we have something like a conflict between experience and dogma. It is almost taken for granted that our preaching—as well as our theology—must be based on experience, and that dogma is, at best, secondary, or at worst, an actual hindrance to modern religion.

The danger of the dogmatic Church is not far to seek. There is a risk of religion founded on the acceptance of dogma becoming cold and aloof, and, especially, ethically powerless. There may be assent to dogma which carries no moral intent. The historic revolt from Catholicism took place partly because it was clear from numberless examples that a man might assent to the Church's dogma, and be a scoundrel; a Church that held the body of dogmatic truth could yet be largely corrupt. Even in those days there were some who lived upon experience, and escape the general condemnation.

What is the place of dogma in human knowledge, and what is its rank and prestige as a means of encompassing truth? There have been only three ways of human knowledge, with three corresponding criteria of certainty, known to men. The first is Reason, with rational demonstration as its criterion. The second is Mysticism, with experience as its standard. The third is Faith, with authority as its test of truth. The rational method, the method of philosophy and the sciences, was developed by the Greeks, especially Aristotle. When Greek philosophy became bankrupt in the age of scepticism and eclecticism, and it seemed that truth lay beyond human reason, the Neo-Platonists delved deep into Plato's thought, and found a new way, making an appeal to immediate certainty through personal experience of reality. This is the mystical or intuitional mode of reaching truth, and it found rich opportunity later within Christian thought. But Christianity added to these a *third* means of knowledge. This is faith, based on revelation. It existed already as an inferior idea in Plato (ἡ πίστις) but with Christianity it became an entirely new thing, and a recognized way of certainty. The principle of faith as a philosophic principle of valid knowledge deserves fuller investigation than we can give it. It is not to be confused with mystical experience, which is the result of direct revelation to the individual soul. Faith rests on a revelation objectively made, open to all conscious minds that regard it. Its basis is not primarily a philosophical, but a historical, fact. But Christian faith has two aspects. It is at once an intellectual and a moral act; it is an affirmation of the truth, and a moral surrender to it. Thus faith has two sides, one cognitive and the other volitional. Both St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas define it as "cum assensu¹ cogitare". It is an intellectual assent promoted by the will.² Faith differs in this respect from rational assent; a "will to believe" takes the place of the cogency of logic and facts. What then, distinguishes it from mere delusion? Clearly, nothing but the nature of the authority, regarded as unimpeachable, which inclines the mind to believe. With the growth of the Catholic Church, faith became more and more intellectualized, or in other words, its cognitive side was emphasized, so that it came to mean intellectual and moral assent to the *Creed* of the Church, and was closely associated with the authority of the Church, which guaranteed the truth of the revelation.

Now dogma is the content of the cognitive side of faith. It is the "*fides quae creditur*". Historical theology has revised the nature of the authority, rather than removed authority from faith. Protestant thought laid the stress on the "*fides qua creditur*", but dogma

¹ Aquinas's Latin is less classical. He writes: "assensione"!

² "cum enim Credere ad intellectum pertineat, prout est a voluntate motus ad assentiendum". (Aquinas. *Summa Theol.*, 2, 2a, Q. 2, Art. 1.)

remains, with always a reference to authority. The word "dogmatism" has been under a shadow ever since Kant helped to bring it into disrepute. There is a common untechnical use of it which implies a merely magisterial assertion, based on insufficient authority, sometimes no more than an individual opinion. "If I say it three times, it is true!". Any preacher who is dogmatic in this lower sense rightly loses influence. But the teaching of Christian dogma is not mere "dogmatism"! For dogma is the intellectual content of faith; it is this content which became crystallized in the Creeds. Further, dogma is to be distinguished from theology. It is the statement of the fundamental revelation, while theology is the fruit of reflexion upon it. "Dogma and theological proposition are related as doctrine and proof, as judgment and reasons for the judgment¹." Whether it can be entirely separated from theology is uncertain, for it may be claimed that there is theologizing in the Creeds themselves. Yet while we have a revealed religion, we must have dogma. In a natural theology there are only rational conclusions. But if religion is revealed then dogma is the statement of the truth revealed, which the rational mind may not be able to reach.

But the battle between dogma and experience, as grounds of truth, goes on. This is the modern form of the unending conflict between the theologian and the mystic. The religion of experience is disturbing to the dogmatist, for it suggests new ways of inward certainty which are difficult to verify. "The dogmatist ever kept watch over the mystic", says Hoffding², "so often carried by the tides of inner life beyond the limits of feeling sanctioned by the Church as right and true". Shall we follow this way of experience, and abandon dogma, in this age, which, with its intense desire for reality and its psychological pre-occupation, is inclined to measure truth by what it experiences of it? Yet we cannot all be mystics, while if we accept what the authentic mystic tells us, that, for us, is a dogma still!

But perhaps the chasm has seldom been as wide as it appears. It is reassuring to remember the dependence of the mystic on the dogmas of the Church. Mystical experience in its main stream has never given an independent and divergent body of truth. Christian mysticism has flourished within the limits of the Church's teaching; it has on the whole always witnessed to the facts of revealed truth. Mysticism has occasionally produced its own theology, as in Pseudo-Dionysius or Hugo of St. Victor. But it depended always on Christian teaching and tradition; it is a witness to *Christian* truth. "It is precisely in the convictions which he (the mystic) shares with the Church Catholic", writes Mrs. E. Herman³, "that his specific genius finds its most characteristic expression", and a study of the

¹ Cf. J. E. Erdmann, *Hist. of Philos.* I, 279.

² *History of Modern Philosophy*, I. 8.

³ *The Meaning and Value of Mysticism*, 299

leading mystics confirms this judgment. If we compare, for example, St. Bonaventura and Plotinus—both authentic mystics—while we assume that each has experience of reality, the experience of the Christian is of the Truth revealed in Christ, and that of the Neo-Platonist of the Deity without Him. Christian mysticism is characterized as experience *mediated through Christ*; this marks it off from all theosophies. It appears that valid experience of Christian truth does not depart from the Church's teaching, in essence and basal fact.

No truth, indeed, can be unrelated to experience, for only as it is in that relation can it be known. Dogma also is ultimately the fruit of experience, but it is based on the *corporate* experience of the Church, and is the statement of that objective reality which the Church's whole experience validifies and proclaims, and which it tried to state objectively in the Creeds.

Now there are Churches which maintain that they have no Creed. But surely this does not mean that they are without dogmatic truth! When the Congregational Churches, for example, affirm that principle of the creedless Church, they refer, of course, to a *written* Creed; they have no *Confessio*, no document by which they measure truth. But in the larger sense, few would wish to maintain that they have no *Credenda*, no truths to be believed.

May we go further, and at some risk (!) suggest that such credal freedom as we enjoy is largely maintained for us by those who do not possess it? The late Father Tyrrell is often quoted as saying that if the Catholic Church were to die, the other Churches might order their coffins! Unpalatable as the claim is, there may be an element of truth in it. We should certainly suffer if the credal Churches were not present in the field. Is it possible that we can enjoy this irresponsibility, exist without a "creed", because the other Churches are maintaining dogmatic truth with us? Are we flourishing in an atmosphere which they have created? I may manage to see without a candle in my own hand because my friend holds his candle. But if he lets his candle fall we are both in the dark. It is possible that if the other Churches vanished, and left us alone, we might soon have to formulate a "Creed", a statement of Christian dogma, which, we trust, our principles would prevent us from mis-using! However this may be, it is clear that Congregationalism also has its *Credenda*; it upholds Christian truth, even though there be no official formula.

In religious circles where dogmatic truth is belittled, there is almost always a tendency to degenerate from the true idea of the Church. So far as to-day's revolt from what are considered old-fashioned dogmas implies that truth should be continually re-stated in the mental dialect of the time, it is healthy. But there are groups where the central idea is that of a "Quest for Truth". Such a quest is essential for spiritual life—yet this idea alone leads to aloofness, to

the rise of rival societies of a semi-spiritual character. We have soon a mere "religious society", just as we may have a Scientific or Literary Society. But a group of people "interested in religion" is a very different thing from a Church, urged by its vision of divine truth to a world-winning task. The weakness is that what is called a "quest" is often nothing more than an excursion! The authentic Church, in fact, begins with truth *given*, which it proceeds to verify in experience. That is the real spiritual quest.

We may claim, then, in spite of the emphasis of to-day on experiential religion, that dogma has a real and important place in preaching. St. Thomas Aquinas's justification of dogmatic truth, and the need of faith, can hardly be improved upon even now. Without it, he claims, it would be difficult or impossible for us to arrive at the truth. For the knowledge of God which reason can reach is only attainable by the few, who are fitted for its apprehension, are unhindered by temporal affairs, and pursue it "*pro amore scientiæ*". Even one with all these qualities "*vix post longum tempus pertingeret*"—the passions of youth divert the mind, while the depth of truth evades all but the most persistent thinker. Moreover, human knowledge is mingled with error, and wise men teach different wisdom. It is fitting, therefore, says St. Thomas¹, that the truth about divine things should be revealed with certainty by faith. Hence the divine mercy has provided that even some things which may not be beyond reason should be included in faith, so that all may easily share divine knowledge without doubt or error. Even one old woman (*modo una vetula*), he writes elsewhere, knows more of the things that belong to faith than all the ancient philosophers. This involves a truth which is vital to our religion. Saving knowledge is not the reward of mental effort. Christianity is not a religion for intellectuals only—a truth to be pondered over by many moderns.

The value of dogma to the Christian preacher lies first in the fact that it stands for *objective* religious truth. The preacher who learns much from experience — as all preachers should — should have a sound basis of objective truth to rely upon. Dogma stands for all the truth which lies beyond *my* experience, or the individual experience of any. Surely it ought to be possible to realize, without falling into obscurantism, that we are here, in the main, to proclaim not our own thoughts, but what the Church teaches about God and human destiny! Moreover, it should be remembered that a man's experience, however vivid and convincing, cannot itself carry conviction to others. Personal experience is in essence incommunicable, though the listener may gain something by intuition. Nor could a man's experience alone ever be enough. We cannot hold much of God. The deepest mind is only a shallow trough for the divine

¹ *Summa con. Gent.*, Bk. 1, Ch. 4.

stream. Only the most eminent in depth and saintliness could even attempt it. Necessary as personal experience is for effective preaching, the truth must have objectivity. It must be independent in the last resort of the personal relation if religion is to take its place as a genuine apprehension of reality, among other modes of approach open to the mind.

It is the neglect of this aspect that has done so much to lower the objective validity of religious experience among men who follow philosophical and scientific truth. The metaphysical basis of religion has been sadly overlooked. Dr. R. S. Franks in his latest volume, *The Metaphysical Justification of Religion*, has drawn our attention to this. He feels that it is in the pursuit of a true metaphysical basis that the gap between experience and dogma in theological thought may be bridged. This is not to overlook the implicit reference to objectivity which "experience" in its modern sense contains¹, but rather to follow it out. Conflicts over religious experience, Dr. Franks points out, can only be overcome by the relation of our experience to the ultimate grounds of thought and being. That is to say, we need a metaphysic of religion.

Now there is a kind of haste abroad which is impatient of deep and careful thought, and is more anxious to know *how* to preach, and what is *useful* for preaching, rather than what may safely be presented as truth. This kind of mentality labels all careful discussion as "academic"! But no true human activity, least of all preaching, can be based on anything less than an eager desire to know reality. Yet when we hear that frequent phrase in earnest religious discussion—"Now let us get down to reality"—we usually find that we are called by these words to return to what we really feel, to what is most real and convincing in experience! The passion for "reality" is one of the finest attributes of the preacher, but reality is *not* that which it curiously stands for in that current phrase, *vis.*, what is vivid in experience. It has a wider, more ultimate reference; it is not to be interpreted subjectively; it is in essence something which is the limiting Cause of true experience, revealed in it, but independent of it.

That persistent effort to know reality, which metaphysics symbolizes in thought, is not so far away, after all, from the spirit of the true preacher. This is not to insist that the preacher must be a metaphysician! For the preacher, *dogma* stands for that objectivity, that truth grounded in ultimate reality which the philosopher and theologian seek. Let theology discuss its validity: the preacher is, for the moment, only the *proclaimer* of the truth. But if the truth he proclaims is to be convincing *beyond* the moment, it must have objective and independent value. True experience lies within

¹ Cf. James Ward, *Psychol. Principles*, Ch. 1.

the limits of truth, but Christian truth is bounded in human terms by dogma. Fullness of experience gives the preacher passion and power. But unless it lie within these limits, it will be misleading. Coleridge can give with wonderful beauty the experience of an opium dream—and De Quincey too—but this will not do for preaching!

This gives rise to two further reflexions, which ought to be a great comfort and encouragement in the practical work of preaching. The first is that truth is not dependent on our mood, or our emotion. Yet our present personal experience of truth largely is! We approach here the problem, "Should a man ever preach what is not in his own experience?" If he may not then preaching depends almost entirely on the mood of the preacher at the moment. We need not dwell on the well recognized dangers of merely "emotional" preaching. A man's changing moods are too precarious to be the controlling factor in his message. Surely a man *may* preach what goes beyond his experience. There are periods of spiritual drought, of dryness and dearth; there is an ebb and flow of the spirit. No minister is entirely free from hours when the stream runs sluggishly, and his vitality is low. What shall he preach then? The truth remains! Even with dry heart and thirsty lips, he may proclaim what God is able to be to the people, and to himself. I may not cease to pray because I do not "feel like" praying! I may not fail the people, because my own soul has lost the fountain. For the fountain is there, and I have to find it myself as I direct them. The little span of our own faithless hearts is not the measure of God's truth. There is still the Church's truth to fall back upon.

And, secondly, God's truth is not overthrown by our negative experience! There are people whose faith seems to break up when experience is hard. When sorrow came upon others, these people were strong in faith, and facile in comfort. But when they themselves felt in their own experience the bitterness of the sorrow they had comforted, they denied God. The easy phrases were forgotten. "How can God let it be?", they say, "I have lost all faith". We may have all sympathy with their suffering, and yet they are mistaken. It is just as true that God is good, but experience has destroyed their perception of the truth. There was a minister who lost his only child. It was to him a terrible blow. It broke him up, it took his power, he could no longer preach. He gave up the ministry, and went into retirement. But with the deepest sympathy for so sore a hurt, this is a little difficult to forgive. He must often have comforted others in grief, yet his own grief took all comfort away. His sorrow might have added to his strength. How triumphant is faith, when we see a wounded man asserting the innate rightness of things—a man proclaiming God's love, with the tears of his own suffering in his eyes! But here was a ministry based too much on experience and feeling, with too little objective truth. He

could not preach that God is love, because in the circumstances he could not feel it. Yet God is love!—the Church teaches it, wider experience confirms it. There is a message still even for a broken-hearted man. We should remember that while experience may strengthen faith, it can also destroy it. But the thought of the "Teaching Church" is a heartening one. We dwell upon "*ecclesia docta*", and too little upon "*ecclesia docens*", which affirms and maintains in the face of the world—sometimes in the face of experience—the supernatural truth. And often the Church has no other answer than that to the mysteries and sorrows of life.

But there still remains the fact that dogma contains its own difficulties. It frequently appears to be unreasonable to the modern mind; it introduces intellectual difficulties which it does nothing to remove or explain! Nor does the dogmatic method fall in with our current conceptions of the apprehension of truth. This is a large topic, but we must comment on it briefly.

It is a little curious that dogma should so often be suspect in religion, while in other realms of thought it is passed without reflexion. Most people assume that they are capable of judgment upon the problems of religion, whether their equipment and training be much, little, or none! This is in one sense a tribute to the unique universality of religion, even though it result in chaotic opinion; for, as Aquinas reminded us, religion is not apprehended by intellect. But it is strange that most men accept dogmas in other spheres of thought without question or resentment, and with scarcely a doubt as to the reliability of the method. The dogmas of science, *e.g.*, are often as difficult as those of religion, but they arouse no instinctive opposition. Bearing in mind the current attitude to Church dogma, it is interesting to observe that when science draws near to the ultimate reality, and attempts to describe it, its description can be as vague and mysterious as any religious formula. When Professor Eddington tries to give a statement of what may be the ultimate physical reality, he writes¹: "The stuff of the world is Mind-Stuff. . . . I shall have to explain that by 'Mind' I do not here exactly mean Mind, and by 'Stuff' I do not at all mean Stuff"! But this is really not much clearer than the Athanasian Creed! Now we need not interpret Christian dogma as in any sense a hard definition, any more than that of science, but it claims the same privilege as science. It is an assurance that there is an ultimate reality, and that it manifests its nature at least in this or that way. The manifestations allow of some kind of statement, even if God in His essence elude us. So it preserves head-space; it gives us a spiritual universe open at the top, instead of the closed, if spacious, box, bounded by human mind, which the consistent anti-dogmatist would make it. The spiritual

¹ *Nature of the Physical World*, 276.

universe is "open"; every expression in terms of human thought is an attempt to close it; yet express it we must in some way! Any approach, therefore, to *truth* of expression will involve some vagueness, some mystery, even some contradiction. Hence Dr. Eddington's further efforts to explain what he means are not revolting to us. He allows that "Mind-stuff" might well be amended, but when later he tests the alternative term "neutral stuff", and rejects it, this does not shew the absurdity of the position; it shews the inherent difficulty of any ultimate statement. We see the scientist struggling with the ultimate, and do not despise his effort. Dogma in religion attempts the same task, and deserves the same consideration.

For the Christian Church stands for the invasion of our earthly life by a new order of reality. In Christ, says the Church, *God* broke through into our world, and manifested Himself. This message of transcendent truth is embodied in such dogmas as that of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and these have always confronted natural reason as in the main unintelligible; they are to-day, as ever, the objects of the greatest inquiry and doubt. Shall we abandon the Trinity, and find some more rational mode of expression, which might appeal to and convince the mind? So strong is that instinct that probably most men, beginning the study of the Arian controversy, find their first sympathies with Arius. For he did at least try to make the fundamental dogma of the Church *reasonable*, he gave expression to the common instinct! It requires more stability and experience than most of us had in our early years of study to appreciate the significance of the fact that the Church came down on the side of Athanasius. The "Athanasian Creed" is the classic statement of this dogma, but many think that its term "incomprehensible" is the best description of the "creed" itself. This is what comes of trying to express the nature of God in a few sentences. The reader could not do better himself!

But the unique import, the great value, of the dogma lies chiefly in its implications of the nature of Divine reality and truth. The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation insist on this fact—*life and reality are larger than the bounds of reason!* This is a tremendous truth that the world is always in danger of losing; this the Church affirms for the good of the race. This is why the tide rises against her again and again, and beats upon her, yet leaves her unmoved. Intellect leads men away; we assume so easily that there is no reality beyond what it can contain, the best of men are caught napping by the subtle and tyrannous habitude of reason. Yet the Church has never varied in her presentation of this truth—the reality of God is vaster than all the limits of reason. And reason, true to its own nature, has had to be her chief assailant. Men say: "Consider these doctrines! they are not intelligible. Three Persons and One

God—it is a contradiction !” The Church replies : “Whatever your intellect may say, this is truth, that ‘The Word became Flesh and dwelt among us’ ”. “But this is absurd ; it cannot be made reasonable ; how could God become Man ?”—and the Church answers : “It matters little ; life and truth are greater than the intellect at its highest ; the Word became Flesh, and dwelt among us”. When despair invades their hearts, and the sorrows of life break their strength, her voice is heard : “Yet the Word became Flesh”. When all earthly power seems to fail, and life is seen as a poor groping in the dark, she says : “He dwelt among us”. In the hour when intellect is laid low, in the extremity of the soul, the Church has nothing more to say than that, but it is enough, and none other could say it.

If there is any real revelation of God at all, it will be sure to be a little inexplicable. If God *did* shew Himself in the world, the knowledge we have of Him will shade off into the unknown greatness beyond, it will contain things which do not tally with the little rules of worldly wisdom. He will come “trailing clouds of glory” that fade out beyond our sight. We should be suspicious of a revelation we could fully understand, for it could not reveal the infinite. Intellectual difficulty is a feature which would have to be present, if it even approaches the truth about God. In fact, if this difficulty were not present, its absence would soon become a difficulty !

The Church’s wisdom, divinely inspired, is enshrined in her dogma, always the storm centre, yet always the rallying point. We must not be obscurantist, willing to accept with no effort to understand. We ought, on the contrary, to expend our best endeavour to express truth in terms that come near to modern habits of thought. But let us not find, while we make that approach, that we are retreating from the truth ! We dare not abolish dogma, for the intellectual difficulty which tempts us ever to new statement is, we have shewn, a necessity of transcendent truth. It is just here that Faith makes its leap. By avoiding the difficulty, we get a more satisfactory statement, but are so much the more remote from the truth about God. Certainly do not let faith usurp the rightful place of reason, but do not allow reason to succeed in its attempt to abolish faith !

There should be no genuine conflict between experience and dogma. The preacher has the unique message of truth which the world of men needs, and his own heart in which to fashion and mould it for their reception. Perhaps preaching may be compared with the process of “soldering”. Experience welds the reality of God on to human life, and the preacher is the “soldering iron”. With the heat of personal experience, he brings the human soul into contact, and into coalescence, with the divine reality in Christ. Surely that which encourages men, and keeps them at their task, is not only such minute experience of God as He may confer upon them to their soul’s capacity, but the knowledge that they stand for His truth, truth

which the world could not have invented, and dare not lose. Though men rail and scoff, their logic moves below the truth, and cannot touch it. That which distinguishes the Church from all other institutions is this supernatural aspect, this divine revelation, this body of superhuman truth, this Coming of God. The Word has been uttered—all human words are but sounds without meaning compared with Him. His is the Name above every name, that must be spoken for men's need.

“ No voice but an Eternal Voice
Could speak the world's relief.”

Thank God for the truth which abides beyond our changing moods—for the dogmatic truth which we can preach !

WM. A. PAINTER.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE (1805—1872).

A PERSONAL REMINISCENCE.

WHEN I entered Spring Hill College, Birmingham, in September, 1872, I found that I had passed out of a somewhat dark and chilly atmosphere into one comparatively warm and bright—much to my content. I don't suppose we were stricter in our orthodoxy at the Old Meeting House (so called, before its re-baptism into Baxter Church), Kidderminster, than other Congregational churches, but we were orthodox enough. I was brought up on John Angell James, and remember how, when I sought admission to the Church at the age of 15, I had his *Anxious Inquirer* and *Christian Progress* put into my hands with the advice to read them—especially the former—on my knees. I did so, and vainly tried to make myself feel as the revered minister of Carrs Lane directed. It was a great relief, about a year later, to come under the influence of a young well-educated Sunday School teacher who introduced me to *Ecce Homo* and assured me that what God wanted of me was not simply to believe this, that, or the other, and to go through a prescribed course of experience, but rather to know and love and follow His son, Jesus Christ. I owed more to my teacher than to anyone else. His sweet reasonableness, for the first time, made religion seem sweet. But what opened the door for me into a larger mental world was a visit of John Hunter to the Old Meeting House. He preached there as a "supply" a month or two after he had accepted Salem Chapel, York—where the rush of his eloquence, resembling that of their old minister Mr. Parsons, together with something new, carried the people off their feet. His fame can hardly have reached the Old Meeting House; for the leading deacon at whose house he stayed was overheard to remark that the young man hadn't said a word of any account during the whole of the previous evening; and he didn't expect much from him in the pulpit. He was agreeably surprised, while, for me, Hunter's two sermons (to say nothing of his prayers) had a pentecostal effect. Never before and never since has a preacher so completely mastered me. There was a kind of hypnotic power, combined with an effusion of light, which thrilled me to the centre. And the mainspring of his fascination was not the rushing eloquence, but "the something more". His texts were familiar—in the morning "I am the resurrection and the life", in the evening "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and for ever". No doubt, I had heard sermons on them before. What, however, I had not heard before was the new meaning attached to "resurrection" and "life", the new significance attached to Jesus Christ. And the point is that, when my College life began, I soon discovered that the new light which had come to

me through Hunter had come to him through Maurice. One of the senior students was John T. Stannard—afterwards minister of Ramsden Street, Huddersfield, and the subject of a law-suit which turned him out for heresy. To him Hunter was a hero—his chief of men, about whom he loved to talk. This formed an immediate link between us, and I had soon told him of my fascination at Kidderminster. Then he told me of Maurice. It shows how withdrawn I must have been from the main stream of events that Maurice was not even a name to me. He had died in the previous April, and—writes his son—

“there followed, both in the pulpit and in the press, such a burst of grateful recognition of the national service he had rendered as fairly staggered numbers who had never heard his name before, or had known him only under false conceptions of him. It was said to me, by more than one man at the time, that the spontaneity and universality of the feeling was so marked that there did not seem to them to have been anything like it in England since the Duke of Wellington’s death”.

Some account of Maurice, therefore, must have appeared, if not in the local paper, yet in the *Christian World*,¹ which my father took and read carefully week by week. But if he read about him, he did not mention him, and if he had heard of him as an Anglican heretic, I can imagine that his silence was prudentially deliberate. Anglicans and Dissenters were not so friendly then as they are now—still less Dissenters and Anglican heretics. Anyhow, Stannard was the first to acquaint me with Maurice, and his assurance that Hunter sat at his feet drew me to the latter at once. Stannard also professed to sit at the feet of Maurice, but he was rather a desultory student. I think he read George MacDonald more than Maurice—so getting his Mauriceanism in a diluted form. He would get it in the same form through his reading of Charles Kingsley, and, more condensed, in the small treatises of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. Erskine, Kingsley, George MacDonald were all favourites at that time among the students; so, too, in a less degree was A. J. Scott, whom George MacDonald and James Baldwin Brown alike revered. But if Scott, as he did, avowed himself Maurice’s disciple, this puts the latter at the head of the whole group.

There was one man in the College who had no manner of doubt that this was Maurice’s right position. He was the purest Mauriceian I have ever known, not only in his thinking but even in his character. I refer to J. Henwood Toms, still living at the age of 84 in Australia and venerated throughout New South Wales by all Congregationalists. He became the first minister of the new Congregational Church at Aston, Birmingham; and I have just read the letter which he wrote to me on 5th July, 1884, announcing his departure to

¹ This has been kindly confirmed for me from the C.W. office: “The notices of Maurice’s death were long and appreciative”.

Australia in the following September. Years of devoted service beyond his strength had brought on what seemed to be the first stage of consumption; and the doctors had advised that, to save his life, he must not winter again in England. "You will understand", he says, "without my enlarging upon it, that this great change is one which I cannot make without most painful feelings"; and—he adds—"my only consolation is that God overrules all and that He will be as near in the new land as in the old". His faith has been justified by the experience of 46 years, through which, as minister, as Secretary of the N.S.W. Union, as Chairman, his strength has proved equal to his day, while he has gathered to himself the reverence, trust, and love of all his brethren. I have not seen him for well nigh fifty years but my thoughts of him are as fresh as when—my senior by nine years—he made me his friend; and, among other benefits, talked of Maurice, threw light upon his life, set me reading his books. After reading the *Theological Essays and Religions of the World*, I fancy my enthusiasm was almost equal to his own, though less intelligent. Another student, my senior by two years in status, was a no less ardent neophyte. He is now Canon Thomas, Rector of Northbourne, Kent. We three used to meet for discussion and (what the younglings needed) for elucidation. Some others, too, caught fire more or less.

In fact, a Mauriceian cult grew up, and probably did more to shape our theology than the lectures of the principal, Dr. Simon. We valued these, and some of us came to see that fundamentally they were quite in accord with Maurice. But *he* did not think so. Simon was, above everything, a systematic thinker. So was Maurice. Simon, however, was always in search of the right word, and a sparing use of words, and their due logical sequence in an orderly argument. Maurice, he thought, was too careless of definition, used too many words, and often so used them as to cloud the argument. His own ever-recurring question was, "What do you mean?"; and if, putting that question to Maurice, he got, or seemed to get, a doubtful answer, he felt impatient, and inclined to dismiss him. Of course, moreover, there was a profound difference, so Simon thought, in their respective interpretations of the Atonement, his special theme of study. Hence, on the whole, he did not encourage us to read Maurice. We had to serve, so to speak, at an altar outside the gate! Perhaps we served it the more eagerly on that account. At any rate, I, for one, plunged heart and soul into Maurice, read all his books I could borrow, bought one or two when possible, and, like Kingsley, might almost say I lived upon him, as John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, lived on Benjamin Whichcote.

About the same time (1874) our Mauriceian ardour was fed a little by a Mauriceian study-circle which had its centre in London, with a membership of individuals and groups throughout the country. How

many there were, or who were the leaders, I do not know, nor how long the circle survived. But it consisted chiefly of clergy, and had a MS. Magazine made up of papers on aspects of the master's teaching, and, I think, hints of how to apply it, and what to read. This went the round and in due course came to us. We were asked to criticize as well as read it, and even to add something of our own. I was too much of a novice to dream of doing the latter, but I seem to remember that Mr. Toms made one or more contributions; and I distinctly remember that the whole thing struck me as very dull. I was glad to get back to the springs—Maurice's books. I notice the "circle" merely as a sign of the devotion which had grown up around Maurice as it did, on a larger scale, around Browning and Carlyle—a kind of devotion which Maurice himself always deprecated.

When I left Spring Hill in the summer of 1877 Maurice meant far more to me than Simon, and this relation was never quite reversed, though the latter's merits as a great teacher, along with a deep sense of personal indebtedness, gave him a unique place in my affectionate reverence. I may be wrong, but I incline to say that a majority of our younger ministers in 1877 bore the Mauriceian stamp, if under that description may be included what they drew from Thomas Erskine, McLeod Campbell, A. J. Scott, and George MacDonald. These, I am sure, were the favourite authors of my own friends in the ministry; and the man to whom we looked up with enthusiastic trust as leader was James Baldwin Brown, who knew Maurice personally, corresponded with him, and sympathized fully with the spirit and scope of his teachings and very strongly with his efforts in favour of the working classes. "In their enthusiasm on this point they were entirely one, as they were also in their determined opposition—much to their own cost—to the tone and spirit of a certain portion of the so-called Religious Press." Whatever might be the influence of other leaders over the older men of our churches during the great decade from 1875 to 1885, Baldwin Brown was the one who, more than anyone else, captured the younger men—captured their imagination by the very poise of his body, captured their heart by his fearless championship of all that he believed to be right and true, captured their reason by his passionate and persuasive presentation of a real Gospel, a Gospel of love, a Gospel for all men, a Gospel above and beyond all narrowing dogmas. He was the Charles Kingsley of the Free Churches, the mediator of Maurice to them. He represented and expressed the best side of the Leicester Conference in 1878; and his was the real victory, however a majority vote might appear to claim it for a return to the old paths. The young men felt this and enlisted under his banner, and set themselves quietly to preach his gospel, Maurice's gospel, and did so with such effect that it is now generally accepted as a commonplace—not *his* gospel, or Maurice's, but the unquestionable gospel of Paul and Jesus.

I am now a belated specimen of the young men of that time; and, if I bear witness of what Maurice did for me, it is but to illustrate a process by which, as in the pioneer case of Baldwin Brown, Maurice came into his own.

(1) For me, he made the Bible a new book. His two volumes of sermons on the *Patriarchs and Lawgivers* and the *Prophets and Kings* of the *Old Testament* were among those I read first. I had learnt as a boy to take the Scriptures as an infallible book of texts. Maurice taught me to take them as a book of life. Into the question of occasional errors or inconsistencies he did not enter. The day of the higher critic had not yet arrived, or was only at the dawn (1852). But its coming could have made no difference to his method. The higher critic is in search of facts—historic facts. Maurice was with him in this. He once wrote to R. H. Hutton of the *Spectator*:

“I have called for the application of the most severe tests to its records. I have said that they ought to bear it if the book is what it assumes to be, and that Christians have wronged and degraded it by severing it from all other books instead of manfully evincing their own confidence in its veracity and its strength by trying whether it will not throw light upon all.”

A man who wrote thus would have felt it a duty to accept whatever a critic like Peake might demonstrate to be the fact about the origin of a book, or its author, or its date, or its characters, or its events. When he stood out against Colenso and his book on the Pentateuch (1862) it was not because Colenso was a historical critic, but a carper—making much, *e.g.*, of merely arithmetical mistakes which are irrelevant to the substantial truth and the high spiritual purpose of the records as a whole. When Kingsley asked him (in 1844) how he should read and teach the Scriptures, Maurice answered that he

“had been solemnly and inwardly impressed with the truth that the Bible, as a means of attaining to the knowledge of the living God is precious beyond all expression or conception; but, when made a substitute for that knowledge may become a greater deadener to the human spirit than all other books”.

The Bible, he said,

“is a human history containing a gradual discovery of God, which discovery awakens the very faculties and apprehensions to receive it”.

This was written 37 years before Bruce's *Chief End of Revelation*; and his discourses on the Old Testament showed how the end was reached through the experience of Patriarchs, Priests, Prophets, Kings, and common folk, in a way which made the Bible a new book—a book of life and light. Nor need the results of the critical, or as Maurice called it the scientific, study of the Bible make it less so. Rightly apprehended they make it more.

(2) He saved me from Unitarianism. Dr. Simon once said hyperbolically that there seemed to be an epidemic of Unitarianism.

He meant among the students; and he spoke with one or two particular cases in mind. The time was about 1875. At that time there did seem to be some ground for alarm. One or two Unitarian writers were very popular among the men. Martineau especially was exercising a sort of fascination. And there was no disgrace in being fascinated by Martineau. One who might begin to read him, as I did, in his *Endeavours after the Christian Life*, could hardly help being fascinated, if he had any religious instinct at all. There was such insight and power in his delineations of the Christian ideal, there was so profound and affectionate a devotion to Christ, that one was led to ask, what more is there to desire? What more of divinity can be claimed for Jesus than to make Him, as Martineau makes Him, the perfect moral image of God? The temptation to rest content with this was very strong, and has been recurrently strong in my own case ever since. But there were questions which Martineau did not answer. What about the essential relation of Jesus to God Whom he called His own Father? Was He speaking in a metaphor? What about His essential relation to the Spirit of God with Whom Paul, *e.g.*, identifies Him? What about His pre-existence—"born first before all the creation"? What about His resurrection when He was "installed as Son of God with power by the spirit of holiness"? What about His ascent to the right hand of God, or the seat of authority over things "in heaven, on earth, and underneath the earth"? What about the tremendous assertion that "all things have been created by Him, and for Him; He is prior to all and all coheres in Him"? To ignore all this, as Martineau seemed to do, was, I thought, to ignore, on a *priori* grounds, what is explicitly affirmed—without demur from the historical critic or from sound reason—in the New Testament. Must not Jesus, then, be one with God in a deeper sense than Martineau allowed? Must He not be, however distinct in person, essentially one with Him? Must not Father, Son, and Spirit be essentially one and the same?

Maurice helped here, as Simon failed to do, because, although (to use his own phrase) the latter "revelled in the Trinity", his treatment of the subject was, for me, too speculative and metaphysical; whereas Maurice approached it, as Paul did, from the side of experience. He had been reared in a Unitarian home: when he was 16 his mother broke away from her husband's faith and joined a Calvinistic sect; as a result, the shock to his own faith threw him into a period of agonizing doubt, through which he fought his way, step by step, into a living conviction that the name "Father, Son, and Spirit" declared the reality, or truth of God. Every step forward answered to a phase of his experience, was tested by experience rather than by "proof texts"—which he regarded as mere pointers to experience. So, at last, belief in the Trinity became the rejoicing of his heart no less than the master light of his theological seeing. A

passage in his Essay on "The Trinity in Unity" brings this out clearly, but I prefer to quote from a letter to his sister (17th May, 1845) on Trinity Sunday, which he calls

"the most sacred day of the year, the one which seems to me the most significant of universal blessings, and also which blends most by strange and numberless links with my own individual experience and inward history. The idea of the Unity of the Father and the Son in the Holy Spirit, as the basis of all unity amongst men, as the groundwork of all human society and of all thought, as belonging to little children, and as the highest position of the saints in glory, has been haunting me for a longer time than I can easily look back to. It seems to blend with every book I read and to interpret it, to connect itself with all the sick and dying people about me; to direct all my thoughts about my children, and more than all others together, to bring my vanished saint¹ to me or me to her".

Fourteen years later (September, 1859) he answered "a letter as to the several persons of the Trinity" which had been written to him by the Rev. D. J. Vaughan (afterwards Master of the Temple and Dean) by thus expounding *Ephes.* 3¹⁴⁻²¹:

"No passage, perhaps, on the whole is so helpful for this purpose—*For this cause I bow my knees, etc.*—chiefly because it does not give us a formal result, but explains the process, the continual process, by which the Apostle himself arrived at a living result. He bowed his knees to a Father, not of himself, but of a whole family in Heaven and earth. He asked not for himself apart from the Ephesians, but with them, that they might be strengthened with might by the spirit in the inner man. But this involved the next step: Christ would dwell in their hearts by faith. And that would lead to the next. They would find the ground on which they and all creation stood: *Being rooted and grounded in love*. And so they would know the height and length and breadth of the love of God which passeth knowledge. Here, I conceive, is the doctrine of the Trinity in its most practical form, yet with all its most delicate distinctions, no confounding of the Persons, no division of the substance. And thus is it received and has been received in all ages by thousands of men and women in weakness and suffering, who were utterly unable to enter into scholastic subtleties as they were to fly over the moon."

This last quotation recalls an interesting circumstance connected with the year 1884. Baldwin Brown died in June of that year, and following on that event, or occasioned by it, a somewhat acrid correspondence arose in the *Christian World* about the effect of Mauriceanism on the younger men. Edward White (1819—1898) author of a well-known book, *Conditional Mortality or Life in Christ*, was very emphatic, not to say truculent, in the assertion of his belief that its chief effect was to produce Unitarians. I felt no desire to enter the fray, but I addressed a private letter to him and told him, with all respect, the contrary effect of Maurice on myself. He wrote back at once, and in so gracious a spirit that my feeling towards him under-

¹ His late wife.

went a complete change. No doubt he was a good hater and could be fiercely intolerant of those who maintained what he took to be false doctrine—Picton, *e.g.*, whom he singled out in this letter for a sharp word. But he revealed to me an unexpectedly humble and gentle side of his nature, and proved again the necessity of the Lord's command, "Judge not". There is only room for a sentence or two :

"It is never to be forgotten that Maurice's doctrine was a growth out of Unitarianism (congenital), and was a movement towards orthodoxy — a sort of half-way house towards orthodoxy — specially helpful to a Unitarian on his travels towards the Heavenly Jerusalem. It has preserved many from Unitarianism, I doubt not. There is, however, a double use for a road—towards the Heavenly Jerusalem and away from it, and my point is, that while many have travelled, as you have, along this road upwards, there are others who—starting from orthodoxy (or Evangelicalism) have gone in the other direction, and descended through Mauriceism into Unitarianism of a rather virulent description—all the worse from their previous history."

He adds his opinion that, in this respect, "our own ministry is subject to considerable danger". In my reply I did not dispute his opinion, and I admitted that Maurice's Trinity was not exactly of the orthodox type; but I urged that he had come to it under the guidance of spiritual needs which he felt were satisfied by the revelation of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that the Apostle Paul, starting as a Jew from strict Unitarianism, came to a conception of God as a Trinity in Unity—a conception by no means in verbal agreement with any orthodox creed—by just the same way of personal experience. Of course he did not approve, and in a second letter (24th September) he repeated his belief that "Mr. Maurice's way has proved the *via media* of something exceedingly like Unitarianism". But I think it has proved itself the only living way of faith in the Trinity, and that for most of our ministers (to say the least) the so-called orthodox way has vanished.

(3) Maurice began his Essay "On the Trinity in Unity" with these words—"My first Essay was on Charity; this will also be on Charity". Charity in the full Pauline sense of Love (*I Cor.* 13); love focused in the Cross of Jesus and revealed as the inmost nature of Father, Son, and Spirit; love the sovereign principle of the Universe—Eternal, untiring, all embracing—this was the realized ground of his theology and it was through him that I first caught a clear glimpse of it, though years afterwards my too shallow conviction of its truth was deepened by one whom Maurice greatly respected, a Puritan mystic of the 17th Century, an Independent and a Calvinist, Peter Sterry. Sterry was a Calvinist, but only as Maurice was one. Maurice rendered fervent homage to the ruling idea of Calvinism—even of supralapsarian Calvinism.

"There lies in it (he said) a deep recognition of God as a living Being, an originating will which the feeble frittering phrases of Arminianism can provide no substitute for. The misery of the Calvinist is his constant substitution of the idea of sovereignty for that of righteousness, which is the one always brought before us in Scripture."

Maurice, like the Calvinist, exalted the idea of sovereignty, but, like Sterry, the sovereignty of love—holy love, which includes righteousness. And what *that* is God in Christ has made known. It is the core of the Gospel, the true Christian Calvinism. Here is something he (Dec. 1852) wrote to David Macmillan :

"Mr. ——" (a Calvinist) "asks what right he or I have to know why God does this or that? I have no right, that is to say, I have no power to penetrate the depth of His wisdom. Moreover I have no wish to do it. I am content to be lost in it. But that is because He has been pleased to reveal to me in His Son the brightness of His glory, His absolute love; because He has shown me that in Him there is no darkness at all. On that point I have a right to be certain; he who says I have not rejects the Bible, and disbelieves the incarnation of our Lord. I will not give up an inch of this ground; it is a matter of life and death. I find as many puzzles in the world as Mr. — does; if I thought I could explain them by my experience or my reason, I might be a Calvinist or any other theorist. I cannot; I am baffled, and therefore my heart and reason accept the solution which the incarnation, death, resurrection of Christ offer me. *They tell me that whatever else is not certain, God's absolute love is certain.*¹ They tell me that if any man pretends to have more love than God, to care more for his fellow men than God cares for them, he lies. For that there can be no love which does not come forth from God's love and is not the image of it. If then there are any persons caring for the shopmen of London, for the working-men of London, for the prostitutes of London, I say it is absolutely certain that God cares for them, and that I am setting man above God if I think otherwise or fear to say this. . . ."

Here again is what he wrote a year later (Dec., 1853) to "Members of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn and members of the congregation of Lincoln's Inn Chapel", of which he was Chaplain. He had offered to resign if they approved of his dismissal from his Chair at King's College, and they had replied by expressions of gratitude for his teaching and for himself as a Christian gentleman. Having said he has

"the best reason to know that the minds of numbers in all classes of society—of young men very especially—are unsettled not on some trifling or secondary questions, but on those which affect their inmost faith, and their practical conduct, on those which concern the character of God and their relations to Him",

he comes to what alone can meet their case—a vision of the

"Love that is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, and that will put down evil and establish righteousness throughout the universe.

¹ Italics mine.

. . . I do not repent of any words in which I have spoken to you of this Love as mightier than all which is opposed to it, or of the triumphs which it is yet to achieve. I believe that, if I had spoken more broadly, strongly, freely on this subject I should have done more to make you righteous and true. My fear is not of expanding but of contracting the Gospel which we are sent to preach, not of seeing too strong a testimony in the Bible to the will of Him in whom is light and no darkness at all, but of binding its testimonies to meet my narrow conceptions; not of exaggerating the duty of the Church to be a witness against all hard and cruel conceptions of our Father in Heaven, which lead to a confusion between Him and the Spirit of Evil, but of not perceiving how manifold are the ways in which that duty should be fulfilled. I am sure that if the Gospel is not regarded as a message to all mankind of the redemption which God has effected in His Son; if the Bible is thought to be speaking only of a world to come, and not of a Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace and Truth with which we may be in conformity or in enmity now; if the Church is not felt to be the hallower of all professions and occupations, the bond of all classes, the instrument of reforming abuses, the admonisher of the rich, the friend of the poor, the asserter of the glory of that humanity which Christ bears—we¹ are to blame, and God will call us to account as unfaithful stewards of His treasury”.

In the light of this all else he stood for might be a matter of easy inference.

(a). In May, 1831, the Assembly of the Church of Scotland deposed Mcleod Campbell from his ministry at Row for preaching the Universality of the Atonement. The act was generally popular in Scotland and with the Evangelicals in England. Maurice thought the Church could hardly have acted otherwise, consistently with its confessional standards. It was these that were wrong. In particular, they based its theology “upon the acknowledgement of sin”: human nature must be acknowledged as fallen and depraved and totally alienated from the life of God or desire for Him, or capacity to receive Him. Couple this with the sovereign arbitrary will of God, and it follows that the salvation of few or many must be a matter of election, and the scope of election must be gathered, if at all, from the written Word. So the question of assurance for any man must be indeterminable, or at best most uncertain; while there can be no free Gospel for man as man. Maurice’s instinctive revolt against such doctrine was justified and relieved as early as 1830 by the reading of Erskine’s *The Brazen Serpent*, and then by Campbell’s sermons. To discover the true relation between man and God became to him a matter of vital concern. He was helped, on the one hand, by his appreciation of what he had learnt to see from his Unitarian father, *viz.*, man’s essential dignity and spirituality, notwithstanding his “fall”; and, on the other, by his clearer and clearer apprehension of the fact that Jesus appealed to men as the children of God, as lost and yet loved, as the objects—everyone of them—of a love so immense as

¹ The clergy.

to constrain God to give "His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life". In this way the light broke upon him. He speaks of it as a revelation—a word strongly suggestive of the isolation in which he felt himself to be among his fellow-clergy. Most of them were Evangelicals of the narrow type, while the Liberals (*i.e.*, those called Broad Churchmen at a later time) were "ready to tolerate all opinions in theology, only because people could know nothing about it, and because other studies were better pursued without reference to it". For his own part, he was henceforth a crusader. As he wrote to Erskine (in 1852):

"The task which God has shown me that I am to perform for His Church is that of testifying that the grace of God has appeared to all men."

(b) At the beginning of 1846 Maurice published *The Religions of the World*, the Boyle Lecture of the previous year. It turned out to be, perhaps, the most popular of all his writings, and, if my own case could indicate the reason why, it was because the book delivered people from a spiritual nightmare. I can well remember the horror with which as a boy I listened to a preacher who besought his hearers to support foreign missions because, apart from the Gospel with its plan of salvation, there was no hope of escape for the heathen from everlasting punishment. I believed the statement, of course, for everyone around me believed it—though when I ventured on a question or two, I heard of a sort of loop-hole called "uncovenanted mercies". The matter haunted me for years, and bred doubts which threw scorn on talk about the love of God. Maurice's book scattered them like the dawn. It was glorious to be shown on the best of evidence, the teaching of the New Testament, that God is the loving Father of all men, that He has never left Himself without a witness to them and in them, that the Eternal word has ever been the inner light of every man—the hidden source of all the goodness and truth to which any man has ever attained; that the Word became flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth, on purpose to reveal this fact, and claim all men as his brothers, and offer himself to them as the fulfiller of all their dreams of deliverance from error and sin, and open the way for them to the Father, and assure them of a love which takes note of every human soul, judges every human soul fairly and mercifully, and is bent upon the redemption of every human soul both now and always. These are the pre-suppositions underlying the book which irradiate the discussion of the Religions one by one, and plainly have their root in his theology of the triune name—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Am I wrong in thinking that this Boyle Lecture—with the addresses,

¹ The Liberals (later) changed their character as well as their name, and drew much nearer to him, though he did not live to see it.

sermons, and discussions it evoked—did more than anything else to inspire that new attitude toward the non-Christian world which is now characteristic of the missionary and those who send him forth?

(c) A direct, and to me a crucial, application of his theology appeared in Maurice's doctrine of the Atonement. Sermons on the Atonement were common enough 50 or 60 years ago. They are not so common now, and may it be said that they are not so common now partly because 50 or 60 years ago they were concerned with transactional theories of the Atonement, and because Maurice did much to sweep all these away? A transactional theory, depending, as it does, on the assumption of something in the Father which the Son must remove before sin can be forgiven, was horrible to Maurice. It introduced the sort of variance into the Godhead which destroyed the very idea of grace as the Father's absolutely free, unsolicited, unmerited gift to man through the Son. No, Atonement must be God's way of reconciling man to Himself; and God's way must be love's way, the way of self-sacrifice; and self-sacrifice mediated in the Son because the Father and the Son are one in love to man, and the will to save. He is, moreover, one with man, man's true image, his idea,¹ the heavenly pattern of what he was meant to be. Now,

"supposing the Father's will to be a will to all good; supposing the Son of God, being one with Him, and Lord of man, to obey and fulfil in our flesh that will by entering into the lowest condition into which men had fallen through their sin; supposing this Man to be, for this reason, an object of continual complacency to His Father, and that complacency to be fully drawn out by the death on the Cross; supposing His death to be a sacrifice, the only complete sacrifice ever offered, the entire surrender of the whole spirit and body to God; is not this, in the highest sense, Atonement? Is not the true sinless root of Humanity revealed; is not God in Him reconciled to man? Is not the Cross the meeting point between man and man, between man and God? Is not this meeting point what men, in all times and places, have been looking for? Did any find it till God declared it? And are not we bringing our understandings to the foot of this Cross, when we solemnly abjure all schemes and statements, however sanctioned by the arguments of divines, however plausible as instruments of declamation, which prevent us from believing and proclaiming that in it all the wisdom and truth and glory of God were manifested to the creature; that in it man is presented as a holy and acceptable sacrifice to the Creator?"

This was the doctrine which Dr. Robert Candlish travelled from Edinburgh to London (1854) to tell a crowded audience at Exeter Hall that to his sagacious Scottish intellect it was all nonsense or worse; and then to tell them in the clear set terms of a criminal law court just what the Atonement is, or rather (since the two are identical) what the "doctrine of substitution is". Perhaps he did not see Plato's mark on Maurice, or he may have thought it an aggravation of his guilt to

¹ In Plato's sense.

draw support for a divine truth from a heathen. But it was strange if he could not see that Maurice had Paul on his side—Paul's thought of the heavenly, archetypal, representative man, in whom man was created, in whom he has been redeemed, in whom he died and is risen, in whom he lives and grows and is transformed, in whom he is accepted before God. Maurice's understanding of Paul enabled him to give a true and abiding significance to terms like substitution, satisfaction, propitiation, imputation, justification. Over and over again, *e.g.*, we find him exulting in the assurance that God judges him not as he is in his own poor sinful actual self but as he sees him in Christ, and acquits him not on the ground of what he is now but of what he sees him to be and what at last he will be in Christ. It may be all a delusion, and yet is it? Is it not the same as Luther's spring of joy—*simul peccator et justus*? Re-reading Maurice has brought me back to this with increased confidence.

(d) When Maurice was turned out of his Chair of Theology at King's College in November, 1853, the main plea against him turned on his Essay, "Eternal Life and Eternal Death". He maintained that in the New Testament eternal is not another word for unending time, and that it has a qualitative sense. Eternal life is the life of God, a state of love and purity and joy and peace; eternal death is life apart from God, a state of evil induced by the wilful practice of sin. The former is heaven, the latter is hell. Men, therefore, may begin the enjoyment of eternal life, or heaven, here on earth. They may, also, enter into the experience of hell. There is no doubt that he proved his point—though he certainly overstrained it in his interpretation of some New Testament passages, and of the Athanasian Creed. But I wish to stress two things. One is that he won his victory over the prevalent belief in a material hell of endless duration, not so much by his handling of texts as by the convincing force with which he expounded his Gospel—the old-new Gospel of sovereign love. The battle of texts, indeed, went on, and the issue seemed to fluctuate first to one side then to the other. The issue, however, did not lie with the philologist. Nor did it lie with the critic who might be able to show that this or that text was wrongly ascribed to Jesus and reflected the crude notions of some Jewish apocalypse. It lay with those who should recover that "mind of Christ" which conventional orthodoxy had lost. Maurice beyond all other teachers of his day helped the open-minded—whether clerical or lay—to recover that mind, and so to realize the unspeakable blasphemy of supposing that the God and Father of Jesus could create a hell outside the sinner himself and keep him there in hopeless misery for ever. When once Christian people began to see again the face of God in the face of Jesus they broke loose from the bondage of texts, and felt that all the texts in the world were of no account if their effect was to contradict the absolute, the eternal, the ever-redeeming love of God.

No one born within the last 50 or 60 years can have any adequate idea of the wave of relief which swept through those of us in the Churches who were young and in a state of acute mental revolt against the accepted doctrine of hell. Many older people, who placidly assented to the doctrine because they lacked the imagination to grasp its dreadful implications, experienced a like relief when the truth about God in Christ really came home to them; and some of them, to my knowledge, blessed God for Maurice.

But one needs to stress another thing, *viz.*, the mistake, often made, of saying that Maurice went so far as to assert positively the doctrine of universal restitution. I made the mistake myself—though I ought to have known better—and preached a course of four morning sermons to my poor long-suffering Alnwick people in which I undertook to demonstrate from Scripture the sure and certain salvation of every man at long last and even of the devil, if there was such a being. The sermons did no good, so far as I could see, and simply perplexed and pained my best friends. Many a time since have I thought of my arrogant dogmatism with regret and shame. But, at the time, I believed myself to be following Maurice not only in his doctrine but also in his courageous outspokenness. And yet here were his own words staring me in the face:—

“I ask no one to pronounce, for I dare not pronounce myself, what are the possibilities of resistance in a human will to the loving will of God. There are times when they seem to me—thinking of myself more than others—almost infinite. But I know that there is something which must be infinite. I am obliged to believe in an abyss of love which is deeper than the abyss of death: I dare not lose faith in that love. I sink into death, eternal death, if I do. I must feel that this love is compassing the universe. More about it I cannot know. But God knows. I leave myself and all to Him.”

In such reverent agnosticism should not one be content to wait and hope?

Near the end of 1883—more than eleven years after his death—appeared the authoritative *Life of Maurice*, a fine tribute to the *pietas* of a son who could produce so rich a memorial of his father. It unveiled for the first time his beauty and grandeur, none the less for the defects which it did not conceal. Here we learnt the history of his mind, the growth in it of those principles which made him the man, the churchman, the theologian that he became. We learnt the width and weight of his influence as a student, a preacher, a teacher, a writer; we learnt the power on himself of the truths from which his influence mainly sprang. We learnt to measure the almost incredible meanness and rancour of the hostility which he had to face year after year from those who regarded, or professed to regard, his truths as mischievous falsehoods. We learnt of his profound love of peace and yet of a loyalty to conscience which compelled him to words and deeds that led to the sacrifice of peace; we learnt of his extraordinary

courage in controversy, his honesty, his humility, his magnanimity, his eagerness to see the others' point of view, and give them credit for sincerity, to excuse their mistakes and acknowledge his own. It is the portrait of a Sir Galahad that gradually emerges, and one is not surprised to learn that so he seemed to those who knew him best.

Nor was he otherwise in private than in public life, but the details are more homely. We learnt how he kept under his body—which "was distinctly below the middle height, not above 5 feet 7 inches"—by early rising (hardly ever later than 6 a.m.), by the cold tub, night and morning, winter and summer; by "fasting on all the days prescribed by the Church"; by an imperious "will to work" which at length broke it down. We learnt how he preferred to dictate rather than write his lectures, and how sometimes "he continued dictating all day with only the interruption of luncheon, and dinner at 6.30", how

"his usual manner of dictation was to sit with a pillow on his knees hugged tightly in his arms, or to walk up and down the room still clutching the pillow, or, suddenly sitting down or standing before the fire with the pillow on his knees or under his left arm, to seize a poker and violently attack the fire, then to walk away from it to the further end of the room, return, and poke violently at the fire, not unfrequently in complete unconsciousness of what he was doing, poking the whole of the contents of the fire-place through the bars into the fender".

We learnt how if anyone called to see him, no matter who it might be, he instantly stopped his work, whatever it was, and went in to see the caller; how if a beggar called he invariably gave him something—quite contrary to his avowed theories; how "in all kinds of little ways all day long" he was on the watch to do good by stealth; how once, at any rate, when sitting in a crowded 'bus on a pouring wet day some old apple woman came to the door looking for a seat, and how he, then an old man, instantly got out on the roof. No wonder little children, country villagers, his servants, all adored him. No wonder they and almost every human being who crossed his path were swayed by him. They were swayed by him because he did not seek to sway them. He was among them as one that serveth. Charles Kingsley said "if he had a fault it was that his humility was carried to an extreme". Yet there were times when another aspect of him appeared. "There were times when he could make his words sting like a lash, and burn like a hot iron". Whenever something that he looked upon as morally wrong or mean excited his wrath "he began in a most violent manner to rub together the palms of his hands". "A lady who often saw him thus said that she always expected sparks to fly from his hands and to see him bodily on fire". At the same time, his look and his words were apt to be terrible. Such a man at such a time might well illustrate the wrath of the Lamb.

I will close with a sentence or two which take us to the secret of his life. As early as 1836 Mr. Strachey (afterwards Sir Edward) reported to a friend that

"Miss B speaking of him said, he is a man of much prayer, his sisters told me that when he was with them they frequently found that he had not been in bed all night, having spent the whole night in prayer".

There is a record of him as suddenly surprised in his morning prayers, when it was seen, as he rose hurriedly from his knees, that his eyes were

"depressed by the intense pressure of his hands, the base of each of which had been driven and almost gouged into either eye-socket, the fingers and thumbs pressed down over forehead and head".

And his wife wrote :—

"Whenever he woke in the night he was always praying and in the very early morning I have often pretended to be asleep lest I should disturb him whilst he was pouring out his heart to God. . . . He never began any work or any book without preparing for it by prayer."

Thus he became what Gladstone called him—"a spiritual splendour".

I have written this paper partly in hope of luring some of our younger men to lay aside, if need be, a prejudice, born perhaps of hearsay, against Maurice—as a misty writer and an outworn, ineffectual thinker (according to Matthew Arnold's too-oft-quoted jibe that "he passed his life beating the bush with deep emotion and never starting the hare¹"); and to read him for themselves. They would not always find him easy reading, it is true, but at least they would find him a well of English undefiled; and especially they would find in him a strong reinforcement of the faith—the free Evangelical faith—which has come to them they hardly know how, and whose truth they may take to be self-evident, but which fifty years ago was accounted sheer heresy. Then, I think, they would join with me in rendering a tribute of gratitude to the man who, above all others, rescued that faith from the dust of a dead orthodoxy, and restored its original image and superscription, and, at sore cost to himself, "made it current coin" once more. This was Maurice's glory, though he sought only the greater glory of God.

F. J. POWICKE.

¹ Even so recent and fair a writer as Mr. D. C. Somervell (*English Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 118) after quoting the jibe, can say "his books are no longer readable" because the things for which he contended have become "truisms"—surely a reason which would go far to rule out a reading of all books that treat of ideas once novel, but now commonplace!

"THE FRATERNAL."

THERE are many Fraternals, but there is one in particular. Owing to the fact that it was chronicled that Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke and I represented "The Fraternal" at Dr. R. F. Horton's farewell gathering at Lyndhurst Road, Hampstead, there have been many inquiries about the constitution of this Society. Perhaps I, a nonagenarian who has been a member of "The Fraternal" for 49 years and Secretary for 25, may be allowed to describe it.

Once a month there is a gathering of Congregational, Presbyterian, and Baptist ministers who live in London. They meet in one another's homes for breakfast at nine o'clock, and then proceed to the study of the Greek Testament or some special part of the Old. Sometimes, owing to domestic arrangements, they meet in a vestry, or in Whitefield's Tabernacle or the Baptist Church House.

The breakfasts are occasions for interchange of opinions and suggestions and, often, of humorous stories: the outbursts of laughter on the part of so many reverend gentlemen may possibly shock the souls of those attending to our bodily needs. The breakfasts have sometimes been unique, as when Silvester Horne's table had on it, among other eatables, grilled turkey bones. Dr. Horton has always a large central pork pie on his, and P. T. Thomson, late of Hampstead, allowed his wife to send round plates of tasty turbot. When strawberries are in season it is always evident that "The Fraternal" appreciates them, and the cream that smoothes their way over the palate seems to loosen tongues.

Sometimes distinguished men, from other denominations or other lands, are invited and heartily welcomed. I remember the visit of Archdeacon Sinclair, and how certain words of his led several of us to sign a "Round Robin" to Lord Rosebery, when he was Premier, stating how surprised and pained we, as Nonconformists, were at the way in which such men as Canon Farrar were overlooked when great positions in the Church were to be filled. A week after, the Deanery of Canterbury fell vacant, and Farrar was appointed. He told me afterwards that he could not imagine how the Premier thought of him, but he found an explanation in the letter of "The Fraternal". It may be said that most likely Dissenters indirectly appointed the foremost Dean in the State Church!

How "The Fraternal" began is hardly known. There is a tradition that it began after the *Rivulet* controversy and was a sort of protest against the harsh treatment accorded to the gentle author of "Dismiss me not Thy service, Lord". The books that record the earlier proceedings are lost. The various secretaries seem to have retained their own note books. The Rev. W. Roberts, of Notting-

Hill-Gate Church, never gave up his. I have, however, those of my predecessor, the Rev. Robert Dawson, but they say nothing about the origin of the organization, nor can its present members furnish any information.

After prayer, and the reading of the minutes, the one who gives the breakfast has also to give the exposition of the chapter that follows the one last considered. When it is Dr. Horton's turn to give the exposition, we all know that we shall get the last results of scholarship and research. When Dr. Rushbrooke is able to be present we get from him also first-hand information of the progress of the Gospel and of liberty on the Continent. Not infrequently members who have had to fulfil engagements at great distances will come in fresh from a night in a sleeping car and enjoy the breakfast and exposition before they find their way to their own homes.

I always feel repaid for a journey from Eastbourne to any meeting of "The Fraternal" by the light one gets on Scripture, and the inspiration that comes from fellowship. Dr. Horton would confirm this, for he wrote in his *Autobiography*:

"Outside the constant loyalty and support of Lyndhurst Road . . . the most salutary local influence was 'The Fraternal'. . . . In those days Newman Hall, Edward White, and Joshua Harrison (of Camden Town) made the Society one of unusual value. . . . These were the giants who had been in former days, and they moved among us, the pigmies of a later time."

Yes, and they moved with considerable doubt about Dr. Horton himself. I well remember how, after one gathering when Harrison and Newman Hall and I were talking together, Newman Hall said in respect to some generally received orthodox point that Horton had questioned: "Oh, Joshua, if our young ministers treat that doctrine in such a dubious manner, what will happen to the Church?"

"Oh, let him alone, Newman", said Harrison. "Give him time and he will be as orthodox and evangelical as any of us". Then he put his hand gently on Hall's shoulder and, looking fixedly at him, said solemnly, "We must trust him". Their trust has not been misplaced.

Among those who have ceased membership through removal to other places are the Revs. W. B. Selbie, R. C. Gillie, Anderson Scott, Richard Roberts, Phillips, Yates, Johnston Ross, P. T. Thomson, F. C. Spurr, and W. C. Poole. Among those who have passed to the upper sphere are Joshua Harrison, Newman Hall, Munro Gibson, Edward White, Newton Marshall, J. H. Shakespeare, Silvester Horne, and lastly, F. B. Meyer. Still "The Fraternal" keeps up to its full strength of fifteen, and is as lively and helpful as ever.

FREDERICK HASTINGS.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

THE GROUPING OF CHURCHES.

THE ZONE SCHEME.

THE immediate purpose of this article is to present a description of the working of the Gloucestershire Zone System of Grouped Churches.

Since, however, the Zone Scheme is one among a number of methods of linking churches in associations more or less compact, it is necessary, in order to relate them to one another, to take a brief general survey of the kinds of groups that already exist amongst us.

These may be regarded as ranging themselves roughly under four heads :

- (1) Those which are partnerships in varying degrees of closeness between two or more self-supporting churches.
- (2) Those larger groups in towns or other defined areas wherein all, or practically all, the churches are associated on a co-operative basis.
- (3) Groups of small churches and mission-stations centred about one self-supporting church and dependent upon it for pastoral oversight.
- (4) Groups of two or more aided churches linked by the County Union into a single pastorate.

Either directly or indirectly it is possible for County Unions to be involved in the working of such groups as (2) and (3), their activities being satisfactorily limited to making certain grants in aid. More commonly, however, it is with groups like those described in Section 4 that a County Union is concerned, and here it has to face the often embarrassing alternative of having to support a group of little churches, one or more of which is in an unhealthy state, or of refusing to render any assistance whatever. Usually there is no middle course. The initiative in the selection of a

minister and in all else is with these churches, however unsatisfactory their constitution or spiritual condition; and generally the less qualified they are to exercise such a prerogative the more insistent is their claim to do so. The Union is strictly limited to a single alternative: it may render financial aid or it may refuse it. In such circumstances a refusal may amount almost to an excommunication. On the other hand, to make a grant may be to become a partner, and perhaps a substantial partner, in an arrangement which it has no constitutional power to modify or end. A County Union's power of nomination in the appointment of a minister may occasionally serve all the needs of the case where the pastorate of a single church is involved. But in the case of group pastorates, especially where men are employed as evangelists who have had insufficient training or experience and who often have little or no knowledge of or love for Congregational methods, the need for some more adequate method of "*Church Aid*" is manifest. And if the problem is approached by way of the ministry rather than by way of the churches it is susceptible of a constitutional solution.

The distinctive feature of the Gloucestershire Zone Scheme is that its composite ministry remains directly in touch with the County Union. In a locality in which are a number of churches requiring grants in aid, the County Union establishes an associated group of ministers—a Superintendent Minister (always List A) and one or more assistant ministers (often, though not, of course, necessarily, List B). A church not strong enough alone to maintain a pastor may apply to this *collegium* or group for ministerial service, and if its application is approved it is "admitted into the Zone". In this way the church does not invite an individual to its pastorate; it invites the associated group—the Superintendent of the Zone to be its senior minister and the other members of the group to be assistant ministers.

From the point of view of the County Union the method works out in this wise. Instead of making a grant to a church to enable it to maintain a minister, the Union establishes and maintains a ministerial group, and says in effect to a church needing help: "We offer you a ministry if you will make what contribution is possible toward its maintenance".

FINANCE.

The amount of a church's contribution to the ministerial fund is a matter for adjustment when it enters the Zone, and the amount may be readjusted by mutual agreement in the Zone Council from time to time. In this reckoning all endowments for ministry and all manse must be included. Churches remit to the Treasurer of the County Union, monthly, the amount of their contributions to the ministerial fund. The Treasurer of the Union pays all stipends.

Ministerial engagements are made definite by three-party agreements—the three parties being the County Union Executive, the Zone Council (for the churches), and the minister.

THE ZONE COUNCIL.

The administrative centre of the Zone, as such, is the Council. It is composed of (1) all the ministers in the Zone, (2) two delegates from every church in the Zone, (3) two representatives of the District (or County) Union, and (4) the officers of the County or District Union *ex officio*.

The Council acts in all cases of ministerial change and in such other matters as affect the common life of the Zone. It raises and administers a fund out of which the expenses for printing (preaching plans, *etc.*) and travelling expenses are met.

Of these expenses the greatest inevitably will be those incurred in moving Ministers about for engagements at different points in the Zone. It is possible to get special help in maintaining this "Petrol Fund" from Young People's Societies in the County, for interest can easily be roused among them in work of this character.

Constitutionally the Council has no authority over the individual churches, but experience proves that the churches find it advantageous to bring to the Council a number of matters that are strictly speaking their domestic concern, *e.g.*, alterations, repairs, or financial difficulties. Interests common to all the churches such as Missions, Insurance, and Trusts are inevitably dealt with by the Council, which is also able to relieve the County Executive of a good deal of detail scrutiny when the Schedules come to be discussed.

THE ZONE MINISTRY.

The chief anxiety of a County Union in setting up a Zone will be the discovery of a Superintendent Minister, for upon his character and quality the success or failure of the movement will greatly depend. Too often, unfortunately, financial limitations interfere with free action. And, of course, the conditions vary greatly. In some localities where a number of needy churches suggest the establishment of a Zone the minister of a self-supporting church in the midst of them may be prepared to be overseer of the work. In such a case the County Union will be able to make a financial arrangement that is mutually satisfactory. In other cases it may be necessary to set up an *ad hoc* Superintendent, who, while he lacks a "centre church" to stand behind him, is in this the more free to devote himself equally to all the churches of the Zone.

The work of a Superintendent will, of course, vary with the conditions. In Zones where the Superintendent is first the minister of a church, Sunday service in the other churches will necessarily be limited. But in any case, the Superintendent Minister is expected to

preside at all church meetings in the different churches of the Zone. This is a very important item in the scheme—in some respects probably the most important—for leadership of an authoritative type is one of the greatest needs of the smaller churches. The arrangement of the preaching and pastoral plan will also be his concern, and the exercise of such pastoral oversight as will naturally suggest itself.

The other ministers of the Zone may be stationed either at some central point or at some particular village. In pastoral work it may be necessary to appoint to each a particular *parochia*, but care will need to be exercised to prevent the impression growing that he is the one minister of the church or churches of that particular area. He is a Zone minister, assistant to the Zone Superintendent who is the senior minister of that church and all the churches. For the health of the Zone it is wise to spread the preaching services of every minister over the whole Zone.

In conclusion an attempt may be made to touch upon a few points that may arise in discussing this scheme.

Distances and Size of Area. In envisaging a possible Zone area it should not be forgotten that this is an age of petrol and that churches ten or twelve miles apart are geographically as near to one another to-day as those were that a generation ago had a scant two miles between them. In the two Gloucestershire Zones the distances from the centre of administration to the church at the furthest point are respectively ten and eleven miles.

The Autonomy of the Churches. The freedom of independent churches is interfered with as little (or as much) under this plan as any in which County Unions are involved. Churches are free to associate themselves with the Zone. They are as free to dissociate themselves from it. In the same way the other churches in their County Union are as free to give or withhold grant in aid according as they deem it to be usefully employed or not. Under this method they endow a selected ministry of which, if they think it right, a church in need may avail itself. There is no compulsion at any point beyond the constraint of local circumstance; and that is a factor in any scheme.

Grouping. It often happens that where both financial and geographical conditions point to the union or association of two neighbouring churches under one pastor it is found that of all the churches of a County these particular two are the least likely to merge. Sometimes the traditions of the churches, sometimes local rivalries and jealousies, sometimes social or even industrial circumstances intervene, and happy and fruitful partnership becomes impossible. But if the grouping is on a wider plan and a number of other churches are brought into the circle these two churches may be found to be ready enough to take their place in it, and under a

wise Superintendent, who knows how to use his Zone Council effectively, in a few years both local rivalries and the coldness and exclusiveness engendered of isolation will be found to be disappearing. This is perhaps the happiest feature of the Zone method.

C. ERNEST WATSON.

"A PHILOSOPHIC OFF-DAY."

BEFORE we entered the elementary metaphysics class (and before we knew the adjective which the professor actually and blasphemously applied to it) most of us regarded the philosopher with awe. We believed he had unearthed the final secrets of existence. To our pre-philosophic minds creation seemed to be the production of rabbits out of a hat. But rumours had reached our ears that the philosopher made the hat suffer a sea-change into something called "space-time". And then the rabbits would emerge out of space-time in such a comprehensible manner that the philosopher himself, had he alone been present with primal space-time before existence was, could have predicted rabbits, and "ortolans in Italy", not to mention strawberries and the *Congregational Quarterly*. Nay, we imagined, did we not, that the philosopher, but for some slight deficiency of executive ability, the nature of which he clearly apprehended, could himself have created all these things which bringeth out their host by number? So we eagerly commenced our philosophic apprenticeship. We racked our brains upon what happens to a chair when the poor chair has not a soul in the world either sitting on it or looking at it, utterly convinced that by such disciplines we should eventually attain the vision of the gods. The mere grubbers in history, the dilettantes of literature, the pedlars of languages, the play-boys of science, we looked upon with pity, as children of the charmed circle pity those in the outer darkness whose plight is the more pathetic since they contentedly imagine their darkness to be light.

Alas for our eager dreams! When the first doubt began to rear its menacing head is not easy to say. But, though it may have been in the unphilosophic manner of Topsy's growth, the fact is that doubts did increase in alarming fashion. The day is now long past when any lingering hope of connecting the rabbits with the Absolute still survived. The day, too, is long past when such a disappearance of foolish expectation was accompanied with regrets. For the knowledge that ends in mystery seems preferable to the knowledge that ends in sight. So one found oneself the other day listening, without turning a hair, to the present Gifford Lecturer defining philosophy as the "process of supposing", and the history of philosophy as the story of suppositions in their struggle for the fittest to survive. But

a young student by my side shuddered at the mention of "supposition"; and the look in his eyes revived memories of one's own day-dreams in the long ago. Could the young student have seen a certain section of my "commonplace book", in which the definition of philosophy as supposition would be the most inspiring and respectable definition therein, I tremble to think of his emotions.

For example, there is F. H. Bradley's frank confession about the limitations of his lifework: "*Metaphysics is the finding of bad reasons for what we believe on instinct; but to find those reasons is no less an instinct*". He is a gallant soul who wades through the philosophic waters after so chilly a commencement as that.

Lotze, if anything, is a shade more depressing. "*A philosophical theory*", according to him, "*is an attempt to justify a fundamental view of things which has been adopted in early life*". This rather suggests that a little psycho-analysis could change a monist into a pluralist. Probably pragmatism is the rationalization in adult life of an infantile complex due to the discovery that, if you yelled loudly enough in the cradle, nurse would in the end attend to you.

Leslie Stephen expressed the same opinion in terms somewhat more genteel: "*The concern of a philosopher is to find how conclusions which are agreeable to his emotions can be connected with postulates which are congenial to his intellect*".

These definitions scarcely hold out much promise of producing rabbits, which even the March hare could identify, from the hat. On the contrary, they seem rather to let the cat out of the bag. Nor does Mr. Wildon Carr offer us any consolation. According to him, "*the ideal of philosophy is to find the right way of asking questions, not the final way of answering them*". It would be interesting to learn at what point in his infancy Mr. Carr adopted this attitude to life. Was he once humiliated before guests because he enquired whether Mrs. Smythe-Jones's hair was appearance or reality? No doubt Mr. Carr is not at all popular with the publishers who produce those hefty volumes for harassed parents professing to give them final answers to such questions as "Why has an elephant a trunk?". If our children could be taught to meditate at greater length the right way of asking such questions, it would be an enormous boon to humanity; though we should have been deprived of Mr. Chesterton's reply that "an elephant has a trunk because all elephants have trunks". How would Mr. Carr himself have asked the question? Perhaps he would have asked why a trunk has an elephant. But we shall never know until someone discovers the right way to ask him.

Speaking of questions, however, reminds us that the worst has not yet been revealed. We have yet to hear Dean Inge. In his *Confessio Fidei* he devastatingly declares that "*the history of philosophy since Kant is strewn with the wrecks of systems. The only question is whether any ship is left afloat*". The Dean must

confer with Mr. Carr as to whether this question is rightly formulated. And then, like jesting Pilate, he must not wait for an answer. Of course, a not impossible supposition is that the Dean's own ship appears, to Mr. Carr, fathoms deep beneath the waves; whereas the Dean has the singular impression that it is serenely riding the storm, and is, in fact, the only vessel afloat. His emotions must incline that way. It will not be beyond the powers of a Dean to marry them to postulates congenial to his intellect.

This dark suspicion of the Dean prepares us for the famous remark of Donne, in his Sermon XIX: "*The schools have made so many Divisions and Sub-Divisions of Ignorance, that there goes as much learning to understand Ignorance as Knowledge*". Donne would apparently insinuate that philosophers can potter diligently about their bunks without knowing whether they are afloat or in Davy Jones's locker. Hence Dean Inge's question must have been badly phrased; for if philosophic systems should be submarines, his question becomes absurd. Seriously, though, it is an embarrassing reflexion that we may be dissecting nothing when we believed we were dissecting something. Someone has put much more inconsiderately what Donne said so delicately. "*What often passes for philosophy*", wrote some uncouth person, "*is nonsense fortified by technicality*". And that, as John said of his nice new mackintosh, is that.

The distressing feature of these trenchant remarks is that they have all been made by philosophers themselves. It would have been more tolerable had they been made by Philistines who had never so much as heard of the good Bishop Berkeley. But it is not so. These unkind cuts have been dealt by the ardent pursuers of that very Wisdom whose existence they so seriously question. Or can it be that these are all blows at the other fellow's so-called philosophy? Is this philosophical back-chat; after the manner of the gentleman who staggered the Dublin fish-wives and put their entire vocabulary to shame by calling them "hypotenuse triangles"? Such a supposition would certainly agree with the nasty opinion of the writer who defined metaphysics as merely a term of abuse. It would not, however, harmonize with the Scotsman's opinion. McTavish, it will be recalled by readers of *Punch*, explained the meaning of metaphysics to his wife as follows: "*When the pairty wha listens disna ken what the pairty wha's speaking means, and when the pairty wha's speaking disna ken what he's blethering aboot himsel, that's metaphysics*". One is compelled to admit that abuse is somewhat ineffective if it fails to be understood. Moreover, whatever else may be said of the opinions of the philosophers here quoted, lack of simple meaning is not a possible charge.

It is difficult therefore to say what is the conclusion to this whole matter. Perhaps this is as good as any. The philosopher is

engaged upon the task of "unscrewing the inscrutable"; and we must be indulgent if occasionally he is irascible, and if, just now and again, he calls himself a fool and goes to the pictures. Meanwhile some of us are anxious to glance at the latest candidates for philosophic recognition, who are certain to be finding some mention in the end-pages of this Journal. We are even more anxious to see what the kindly philosophic book-reviewer has done to these candidates. For alas, they may have spent much midnight oil answering a question which should never have been asked. Or worse still, they are stoking up a ship which foundered when Queen Anne was interred. This is inexcusable; for in addition to the not negligible fact that the ship is sunk, there is the graver hindrance to the stoker that the ship was a wind-jammer.

H. G. NEWSHAM.

LITERARY CENSORSHIP.

ANY argument which seems to challenge freedom needs to be defined with what amount of clearness is possible. It is assumed that the claims against which a censorship is to be imposed are that no restraint should be exercised at all in thrusting before the attention of immature youth the facts of physical life; that to dress those facts in such seductive manner that they minister to the arousal and expression of elemental animal passions is necessary for artistic development; that pornography, indeed, is peculiarly desirable.

It is not difficult for those who exercise editorial functions to defend a literary censorship. Such a function finds expression every day. As a result many books and stories and articles are doomed not to come to the birth of the press. The reasons which lead to their rejection need not be enumerated; only the fact that this is a practical censorship constantly at work matters.

Theoretically, those who exercise such a censorship may be on the side of Milton in his plea for the *Liberty of Unlicensed Printing*. He claimed

"that the judgment of the true and the false, what should be published and what suppressed, should not be in the hands of a few men, and these mostly unlearned and of common capacity, erected into a censorship of books—an agency through which no one almost either can or will send into the light anything that is above the vulgar taste".

This seems to anticipate the protest of to-day against policemen and post-office officials and politicians being put in the position of censors of morals.

There are noble passages in the *Areopagitica* to which modern sentiment heartily assents. Take these, for instance :

"For books are as meats and viands are, some of good, some of evil substance, and yet God in that unapocryphal vision said, without exception, 'Rise, Peter, kill and eat', leaving the choice to each man's direction. Wholesome meats to a vitiated stomach differ little or nothing from unwholesome; and best books to a naughty mind are not unapplicable to occasions of evil . . . He that can apprehend and and consider vice with all her baits and seeming pleasures, and yet abstain, and yet distinguish, and yet prefer that which is truly better, he is the true wayfaring Christian. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out to see her adversary, but slinks out of the race where that immortal garland is to be run for notwithstanding dust and heat. Assuredly we bring not innocence into the world. We bring impurity much rather; that which purifies is trial, and trial is by what is contrary."

"For Books are not absolutely dead things, but do contain a potency of life in them to be as active as that soul whose progeny they are; . . . as good almost kill a man as kill a good book. Who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book kills reason itself."

There is that in enlightened human nature which applauds this. Milton is all for the writer's freedom of expression, or to use the Puritan phrase, for liberty of prophesying. Yet it needs only a superficial acquaintance with the *Areopagitica* to know that what he is pleading for is something strikingly different from what is desired by some writers and their supporters to-day. His attitude finds expression in a quotation on the title-page from Euripides:

This is true Liberty, when free-born men
Having to advise the public may speak free,
Which he who can, and will, deserves high praise,
Who neither can nor will, may hold his peace;
What can be juster in a State than this?

He is pleading for books which make a real contribution to knowledge and progress. But he refuses to "be condemned of introducing licence". It must be remembered that the problem of to-day is different from that with which Milton was dealing.

No case against the frank exposition and discussion of physical facts in scientific books can be sustained. Nor can any valid protest be uttered against the many attempts to publish such knowledge in popular form. Books of a serious character can be degraded to sensuous use. These, however, are seldom sought out for this purpose. And most sensible people when they applaud the sentiment:

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
really desire that knowledge concerning the physical basis of life, among other things, should grow.

It is the indecent flaunting of sexual matters in plausible and enticing ways before the young, the impressionable, the immature, that is causing many in these days furiously to think. Readers have their rights, and those who are responsible for youth—parents more

especially—have a right to demand that the means of corrupting both body, mind, and spirit should not be placed deliberately in the way of those whose minds are open to immoral influence. Thomas Hardy's challenge can be accepted :

If way to the Better there be, it exacts a full look at the Worst, yet the audience for the worst should be those who have some sense of proportion. To flaunt the worst enticingly before the very young and to insinuate that this is the better—that there is no other better—is rank treachery, heading directly towards tragedy.

The Victorian prudery has gone and can never return. Boys and girls who have some awareness that they are souls and possess bodies (which means consciousness of body, mind, and soul contributing to a real personality) are of much more use for society than those whose natural curiosity concerning human mechanism was systematically hushed up. Although, it may be interpolated, Victorian boys and girls had more knowledge of matters that were tabu than is imagined in these Georgian days.

No plea can be lodged against the acquisition of legitimate knowledge. Much, however, that to-day masquerades as enlightenment is only abnormality. For this to be flaunted before youth in such manner that it entices to the lower passions and forbids the expansion of healthy sentiments is not in the interests of liberty. It is sheer, blatant, infective licence. And licence must be put in custody to the beneficial tyranny of the law.

It is argued that if any censorship of literature had been in operation in other days much which is justly famed and which is regarded as of inestimable value would have been suppressed. How would some of the books of the Bible have fared, and Shakespeare—to name only outstanding instances—under a censorship of morals? Perhaps the swiftest answer, and the truest, to this question would be that purity does not necessarily mean prudery. To the pure all things are pure. Purity, however, is the test. Mr. Bowdler endeavoured to excise all moral impurities from the text of Shakespeare, with the result that he has added a word to the English language and has himself been, by common consent, bowdlerized. To handle physical fact in the open and unashamed manner of the Bible is not any occasion of offence either for its writers, or to those who read the Bible for its undeviating testimony to the truth that from the levels of man's kinship to the animal there is an ascending way into fellowship with God.

Oblivion scattereth her poppy in strange manner. Yet offence to current taste cannot kill a real book. Oblivion generally comes to what is not worthy to live. This is the censorship exercised by the ruthless judgment of the generations. There will always be some who will desire to suppress what they do not like, merely because

they do not like it; it is also true that some famed authors limit their influence by exposing themselves to criticism from the standpoint of morals. Any picture of passion inspired by exaggerated naturalism is devoid of the element of lastingness. The works of fiction that have caused so much ferment of indignation and commendation of late need not be brought into consideration here. For this applies even to a writer of the calibre of Hardy. Some of his novels suffer and will not survive because they are essentially false to the facts of the universe—they may be true to abnormal human nature, but the abnormal is not essential. This is uttermost truth, or life is a lie—there is truth in the universe. And because of this purity persists.

Why then a censorship? Because books should be at least on the level of decent general conversation. What seeks entrance into the homes of the people should respect the sanctities of home-life. Those who have not sufficient knowledge to reject impure insinuations should not be exposed to seductive sensualism. But most of all because of the growing tendency on the part of irresponsible writers to serve up indecent garbage with the intention to persuade youth that licentiousness is life.

The question arises: how is such a censorship to be exercised effectively? And here difficulties innumerable present themselves. Let Milton be heard again:

“It cannot be denied but that he who is made judge to sit upon the birth or death of Books, whether they be wafted into this world or not, had need to be a man above the common measure, both studious, learned, and judicious: there may else be no mean mistakes in the censure of what is passable or not: which is also no mean injury.”

No problem, however, can claim exemption from endeavours to provide a solution, even if that solution be hazardous to seek, or may prove to be impossible. Yet here there is remedy near to hand.

The most effective censorship would be that exercised by writers themselves. A sense of responsibility to a palpitatingly sensitive constituency would do much to keep the imp of impurity in the ink-pot. The writer's understanding can never be just the same as the reader's understanding. If there is desire to treat matters of physiology and psychology scientifically the presentation should be to those capable of exercising a sane judgment and the form not that which appeals chiefly to those of the age when passion is stronger than reason. To publish prurient fiction at a prohibitive price only makes intenser the desire for what is forbidden. True culture is marked by restraint, and purity never spoiled artistry.

Such a censorship will not appeal to all who have the itch to write. Even then there is another barrier imposed against any official censorship. Very few writers can afford to be their own publishers. For slighter methods of literary work there is the editor to arbitrate whether there shall be publication or not. For books there is the

publisher's reader and beyond him the publisher. If these could co-operate to produce only what ministers to the enduring commonwealth of literature and life, no need of other censorship would arise. And even publishers are amenable to the demands of the highest.

At any rate youth must be protected, and prurient age deserves to be deprived of what panders to passion and lust. What form an effective censorship must take is a matter which needs more consideration than can be given here. There is only need to assert that some sort of censorship does function, although clumsily and therefore unsatisfactorily.

Behind this interest which has been evoked by recent happenings there is a question which must be faced by those who really care for the future of the race. What are those who believe that man's heritage and destiny point on to the highest and best that have been hoped or willed or dreamed doing to bring home to youth right thoughts concerning the body as the habitation of mind and the temple of the soul? When purity is no longer enmeshed in prudery, when healthy-mindedness is regarded as praiseworthy, and life is aflame for enduring beauty, the smut of thinly-disguised obscenity will cease to be attractive. The worst will be regarded only to be rejected. The better and the best will claim life everyway and always. That is the goal; meanwhile there is the road where life wins its soul not without dust and heat.

J. C. MANTRIPP.

THE INSPIRATION OF SUNLIGHT.

THE secret of the greatness of Rome was that she knew wherein others were better than herself, and this is one of the surest roads to greatness. It is impossible to face the future except in the light of past experience and knowledge, and the essence of greatness is knowing what to avoid and what to develop. The three great possible views of life may be said to be—first, the efficient, bodily, and materialistic point of view; second, the unpractical, non-material and spiritual, or medieval, point of view; and third, the point of view of completeness, of perfect balance between means and end, in which the most practically efficient development of body and material is clearly directed to a well-thought-out conception of the highest end of man's mental and spiritual nature. This is the Greek point of view, technically called humanism. It is human both as opposed to the animal and material and equally to vague shadowy dreamings out of relation to this life.

Western civilization is Greek civilization. It was the Greek who first conceived of a free self-governing State. It was the Greek who taught us to think and who won the battle for the freedom of the

mind which is the foundation of our modern civilization. Greece invented our science and scientific reasoning. Much of our language is of Greek origin, and the best of our literature is strongly influenced by Greek. Architectural designs are the immediate product of Greece, especially in America, where Gothic influence is almost negligible and practically everything of value that we have owes its inception to the Greek mind.

Rarely is modern indebtedness to Greek culture recognized and understood, yet, as Professor Stoughton Holbourn has expounded with such remarkable clarity, without knowing or heeding the origin of our modern life it is almost universally assumed that modern civilization is greater than one of which we are hardly ever aware, and expect in our shallow parochialism to surpass things of which we have not even heard.

With the progress of learning the wisdom of the true meaning of the Greek view-point of life is being clarified and understood; but the modern tendency seems unable to cope with such a vast situation all at once, and at present the materialistic point of view is being developed to an amazing extent. The question of the future is whether the completeness of this great view of life will be achieved by the equal development of the spiritual consciousness.

The inspiration of modern sunlight owes its inception to the age of Greek culture, when bodily efficiency reached as near physical perfection as is humanly possible. The deterioration, due to falling away from the original conception, which resulted in sensuality and vice, has continued through the Middle Ages to the present day, and produced deformed manhood and womanhood so far removed from the Greek that the few sculptures of Grecian physical perfection which remain are looked upon as ideals, the attainment of which is impossible. Now, however, there is a definite attempt being made to improve the physical standard, and thereby regain eventually the broad outlook which distinguished the golden age of Greece.

The cult of sunlight is not a return to atheism in any way. Ra and the Cosmic gods of Egypt are dead, but, now the healing power of sunlight has been demonstrated by medical science, it is widely realized that by applying these health-giving rays to modern life physical well-being may be so vastly improved that the conception of physical perfection allied to a high mental and spiritual outlook is within the realm of possibility. A wide movement having physical efficiency as its avowed aim is openly decried and condemned by many intellectuals because they cannot accept the belief that the re-birth of the soul is possible through physical means, and, furthermore, they will not believe that the movement could have such high aspirations and consider it instead to be merely a passing craze for athletics.

Since the war Germany has been most eager to attain this physical ideal, and 7,000,000 young people are now actively participating in the great aim for perfect health. It is these people who will direct the destinies of their country in a few years. If one half of the great view-point of life is gained is it too much to hope that equally ardent endeavours will be made towards realization of that spiritual outlook which, added to physical well-being, attains the great ideal of the body in true harmony with the soul? Hans Suren is one of the leaders of this movement, and to less enlightened people it is illuminating to know what is the German conception of this adoration of sunlight.

This is not the aim of a band of fanatical athletes, for it goes far beyond the attainment of physical perfection. There is something reminiscent of the reactions of the Indian philosopher, Rabindranath Tagore, but the ideas have been adapted to the exigencies of western civilization and now they are being practised not only in Germany, though that country is foremost, but in every civilized country throughout the world. The ideals are not always so clearly formulated as these, but the inherent belief is the same, and the gospel of sunlight is spreading rapidly. Hans Suren believes that the whole theory of this vitalising power which can invigorate a nation rests on the fact that it is impossible to preach virtue to the material-minded man of this present day of deepest, crassest materialism; no matter how the unpleasant truth is disguised, he no longer listens to words from the pulpit and rostrum. Through his material body he must be shown the unknown, clean joy of natural life. In the circle of friendship in verdant nature and warm sunshine he learns to apprehend the power and beauty of the human body. Through the sun-life, and physical training in the sunshine, the joy of his own body awakens in him, and the powerful impulse to serve this joy. This inward impulse becomes a mighty aspiration, which lets him gladly give up the pleasures of our vitiated age. This is how German youth is seeking the re-birth of a nation. It is insufficient to pass off this as a fad, the dream of a fanatic—and it is gross insincerity too. If youth can visualize a dream denied to older eyes, and can strive toward its realization, it is more fitting for leaders of State and Church to hearken gladly and give aid, though they may not fully understand.

Youth ought to be much more conscious of its power. Its strength is by no means in the field of politics, youth and politics being opposites, like physical culture and alcohol. This is the kind of development taking place in the new Germany, and it is stimulating to learn of the rapid advances which have recently been made. To the casual observer, health and youth are the only matters which count in Germany to-day, and throughout the whole of the Reich young and old, rich and poor, are seeking the sun. This cult has been described

as a new revival of Mithraism, a worship of the health-giving rays of the sun, but whereas that religion was finite this is infinite. Germany, who laughed at sport-loving England in the days of her militarism, is now surpassing the whole world in sport. As well as the 7,000,000 young people who are members of sporting organizations the membership of athletic clubs has risen in twelve years from 100,000 to 500,000. Doctors specialize in the care of athletes, and girls' schools now give three hours a week to gymnastics and one day a month to country walking.

In this connexion, we may well stand amazed at the development of the *Wandervögel*, the "birds of passage", as the Germans call those enthusiasts who spend their holidays afoot. A large number of boys and girls in Germany are members of this great organization to-day, and go travelling amid the forests and mountains and all the magnificent scenery of the Schwarzwald, secure in the knowledge that there are no fewer than 2,300 Inns of Youth, scattered throughout Germany, in which a few pence will buy a clean and comfortable bed, cooking may be done, and music and care-free laughter will be encouraged by the good-natured "Father" of the house.

The idea of these *Jugendherbergen*, or Inns of Youth, was first originated in 1911 by an obscure schoolmaster named Richard Schiermann. A small number of barely-furnished rooms provided about 3,000 sleeping places; now in spring and summer 3,000,000 *Wandervögel* sleep every night in these *Jugendherbergen*. The most recent of their gifts is the ancient Westphalian castle of Freusberg on the River St. Seig, which was officially opened by Dr. Severing, the Minister of the Interior, only a few months ago. Not in violent exercise nor in any spirit of professionalism is Germany seeking health, but in giving limbs and organs free and rhythmic play, and using every moment of leisure for the purpose.

Within twenty years from now a new race of people will have been built up in Germany, a magnificent nut-brown generation of young men and women, tanned by the sun in summer, and in winter by radiations artificially produced. The great cities, Berlin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Bremen, Dresden, Leipzig and Düsseldorf, have spent enormous sums of money during the last few years in providing open air swimming baths and glass-roofed baths for the winter complete with apparatus for artificial ultra-violet radiation. "Bath" in Germany now means sunshine and air as well as water baths. At Wansee, the chief centre of the chain of rivers and lakes known as the Havel, which runs through the delightful forests west of Berlin, 100,000 people enjoying sunlight at the same time is a familiar sight on summer days. In the magnificent new Stadium at Frankfurt, claimed as the finest in the world, an artificial sea-side has been made out of a lake running above one of the coalfields of the Ruhr. Artificial waves dash the sides of the latest Berlin swimming bath,

and Cologne, which has grown far more rapidly than any other German city, is spending huge sums on her famous sports meadows by the Rhine. At Dresden a Munich architect has been showing a ball-shaped house of four business storeys, with a restaurant on the top, all covered with windows from parterre to roof, and the sunlight pouring in on every hand.

Throughout the whole country love of sunshine and recognition of its value is increasing with astounding rapidity. The Teutonic motto has always been "thoroughness", but never has it been so clearly evinced as at the present time; even the casual observer cannot fail to be convinced by the ardour which inspires the movement. In two decades Germany will lead the world by attainment of one half of the essential view-point of life, but only the future can answer the query whether equal eagerness will be shown to develop the spiritual and mental view-points in order to gain the completeness of perfection as crystallized in the highest Greek culture.

Other countries are striving toward the light, yet their progress is infinitely slow compared with Germany. America, Sweden, Denmark, Italy have each achieved much, and Britain is also to the front, though insular caution will always prevent the sudden development of anything so spectacular as the *Wandervögel*.

Following the researches of Dr. Rollier of Switzerland, who discovered in 1903 that some forms of tuberculosis could be cured by exposure to the rays of the sun, remarkable developments have been made in the application of this method. Medical science has now demonstrated irrefutably that nothing is more essential for the maintenance and preservation of good health than an adequate supply of sunlight. For various medical uses, and in cases where natural sunlight is unavailable—such as to miners, night-workers and others—radiations similar to those emitted by the sun are produced artificially, and very beneficial results have been gained. Nevertheless, the foremost medical authorities are in entire agreement that the sun is best, and the appreciation of this simple means of health is increasing gradually but steadily.

One of the most noteworthy developments is the interest recently shown in the purity of the skies. Ultra-violet radiation can hardly penetrate the thick smoke pall which overhangs our great industrial cities, and those that do reach the earth are effectively screened from houses and factories by the widespread use of window glasses absolutely impermeable to these rays. A recent report of the General Medical Council states that "about two-thirds of the ultra-violet rays from the sun were cut out by smoke pollution of the atmosphere in the City of London". Yet New York is smokeless, and strangers accustomed to London gloom invariably remark upon the clear sky-line where all the great buildings are in sharp silhouette. The skies of Sheffield are amongst the blackest in Britain, but Essen,

which makes everything which Sheffield does, is smokeless. England is now awakening to the knowledge of the sun. The Public Health (Smoke Abatement) Act of 1926, though touching the fringe only, is an advance in the right direction, and Oldham has given a lead to less-enlightened cities by making preparation for a new power station by which it is hoped to run all the mills by electricity. By freeing the air from smoke-dust and grime and allowing the healing rays to reach sun-starved multitudes, the onset of rickets, tuberculosis, anæmia, and many other diseases will be prevented, and in time they may even be eradicated. The millions of people condemned through false economics to live in congested areas and under insanitary conditions in many large industrial towns are awakening to the need of sunlight, and it is gradually being realized that half the beauty of the mundane things is inspired by sunshine.

The countries of the world are now actively engaged in striving toward the physical standards of Greece when bodily perfection reached its known culmination. At the present rate of progress it will be a considerable number of years before the goal is reached, but, unless prevented by some unknown catastrophe, the time will inevitably come when past experience and knowledge can teach no more and the modern world equals the physical beauty of Greece. The ennobling influence of sunlit Nature will have done much to prepare the way for the development of the non-material and spiritual view-point of life without which completeness is impossible. The ruthless plough of necessity prepares the soil in the human heart, opening it to the voice of reason. Necessity also has driven many to introspection, and compelled them to abandon customs which had become dear. Reasoned contemplation opens into a vision of the future rich with health, strength, and beauty, allied to a true knowledge of the infinite.

What is the culmination of the Grecian view-point? The writers of Greece provide the answer again and again, but it is hard to change and to accept the reasonings of long ago as applicable to modern times. It may therefore be more valuable to understand the great belief upholding the German movement.

There are many enlightened people in Britain who appreciate and understand this striving after the Greek view of the human body, which, as Dr. C. W. Saleeby has stated so emphatically, is incomparably the highest material in the known universe. It is what Hippocrates meant by gymnastics, which is to realize the body and restore it to its natural environment of air and light. Knowledge of the past upholds the belief that re-birth of the spiritual is possible through perfection of the physical, and toward that aim the nations of the world, headed by an enlightened Germany, are striving mightily. The inspiration of sunlight is heading away from tradition and bigotry into a fuller understanding of life.

LEONARD V. DODDS.

PRISON VISITING.

By A PRISON VISITOR.

IN these days of religious unrest, when people are demanding more and more that religion shall be practical, a minister is sometimes faced with a request, perhaps after an inspiring sermon, for information as to how service can best be rendered.

A case actually occurred recently where half a dozen Rover Scouts (senior members of the Boy Scout Movement) waylaid their chaplain at the close of an address which he gave to young people, and demanded information as to how they could best serve their church. All his social efforts were being adequately staffed and he had no numerous vacancies, so he replied that they could best help by attending to the old, familiar things, their every day good turns, their relationships with other people. In short, they were to carry on in just the same old way, plodding along doing all the good they could as they proceeded. It was terribly difficult, and they were greatly disappointed. They felt that they wanted to do something spectacular, something inspiring, and they were full of a vague sense of despondency at the counsel offered. The old, familiar things; how ordinary! And yet the chaplain was absolutely right.

For those who wish to find a practical means of expression for their religious zeal in definite work, few jobs offer a greater appeal than the comparatively new work of prison visiting. The beauty of this sort of work is that it is absolutely personal, and one does not work as part of a society. A man is his own boss and the success or otherwise of his work depends solely upon himself.

The system whereby outside people visit prisons has only been in vogue since 1921, the date of the commencement of the modern prison system as we now know it. Even now the system has not yet been extended to every prison. The idea was that a man tended to deteriorate in the prison atmosphere if no contrast were provided, and that a system which returned a man into society worse than when it received him could only be evil. Accordingly, the prison authorities invited people who were known to be interested in social work to become prison visitors, and to influence other suitable people to take up the work. There are no qualifications beyond a desire to do the work and ordinary aptitude. The prison is divided into a certain number of sections, and a visitor is allotted to each section. The duties of the visitor are to visit each prisoner in his section as often as possible. Most visitors usually do their visiting on Sunday afternoons, but there is no set time. The visitor has to make it his business to learn all about the man he visits, to entertain him and amuse him, and, most of all, to help him both when he is in prison and, if necessary, when he is discharged.

A visitor can do much. First of all the confidence of a man must be gained, then his interest. Often a visitor can help to put things straight between a man and his wife, or his family, or his parents, as the case may be, for many people cast off a sinning brother. Then preparations have to be made for a new start upon the man's discharge. The rest of the time is filled up by trying to improve a chap's outlook by reading, arguing, chatting, and a thousand and one devices revealed only by friendship.

Failure is frequent, success often the exception, but it is a fascinating kind of work. It is so different from the impersonal way in which most of us put sixpence into a collection box or give a penny to a beggar, thinking no more of the incidents. Most of us go through the world quite untouched by the suffering and struggling of what we may call the extreme class of society. It is good to get beneath the veneer of everyday life and to face stark reality, for in addition to so much that is unlovely one comes across striking manifestations of unsuspected beauty.

And after all, are we not one and all individually responsible for the existence of prisons and criminals? We are all members of a society which is responsible for the slums which are the breeding-grounds of crime. Ought we not, then, to make it our business to try to redeem these outcasts? For those who have the time and the inclination it is a much finer way than that of paying someone else to do their part.

And lastly, a powerful argument is often brought forward that it is better for anyone who has the desire to help, to spend his or her time in trying to prevent people from going into prison rather than in trying to set them on the right path when it is too late, as is often the case. In other words, the claims of other social service institutions such as Boys' Clubs and the like should receive priority.

This argument is, I fear, unanswerable. But I think we have a justification for the work in a sentence from the sayings of Christ: "I was in prison and ye came unto me". Deep down in every man or woman, however debased, is a spark of the Divine Fire, waiting to be fanned into flame. If religion cannot tackle a problem like that then surely its critics are justified.

ALEC. R. ELLIS.

A DERBYSHIRE VISITATION SCHEME.

THE ministers of Derbyshire meet in a Fellowship once a month at Victoria Street, Derby. The County Union makes an annual grant of £10 to meet part expenses of those attending.

About this time last year we were discussing the life of the churches in the county, and the idea of a Mission was introduced. The suggestion took root, and as a beginning one minister was asked to

give a paper on "A Mission to the Churches". It proved to be a masterly analysis of the church life of to-day. Its barrenness of spiritual experience, with its accompanying lack of life, was laid bare; then the speaker emphasized the great truth of the ever-present all-sufficing grace and love of God. We all felt humiliated. A small committee was appointed to consider the matter.

After much deliberation it recommended:—

- (i) The holding of a Mission from the second week in October to December.
- (ii) That ten men be chosen by ballot for the work of visitation; further, that they go out two by two.
- (iii) When chosen these men are to meet for prayer, consultation, and study.
- (iv) That as soon as it is decided to hold the Mission, every church in the county be advised and asked to co-operate.
- (v) That the Kingdom of God, in its widest applications, be the Gospel of our message.

The report was duly submitted and adopted unanimously. The ten men were chosen and were also appointed the Mission Committee. They got to work at once. We knew we should need a title for our work, and were bothered considerably about it; eventually "A Visitation of the Churches" was chosen; stilted, we knew, but nothing better would come. Three of our number were asked to draw up a letter to be sent to every member and adherent of the churches coming into the scheme. It is submitted below:—

Dear Friend,

We ministers of the county believe the time has fully come, when in quiet, earnest conference of thought and prayer, a new grasp of the fundamental verities of Christian faith and experience is waiting to be given to us. There is light and truth and power ready to break upon us, adequate to all the needs of our time.

To this end, we have set apart ten of our number to undertake a visitation of all our churches during the autumn. Two of them at your request are to visit your church, and we want them to meet every member and adherent. Our concern is primarily with the enlargement of vision, and the intensification of experience of our own people. Our common theme is "A call to Faith and Service", and we propose to approach it along three lines:—

1. Our personal life.
2. Our fellowship in the church.
3. Our impact upon the world.

We are confident that religion to be of real value to us should be a great inspiration, a fountain of life, an all-controlling constraint. The religion which Jesus Christ makes possible for us all is such. It is a full and satisfying thing, which makes personality victorious, and life a continual appropriation and exercise of grace and love and power. Through it our churches, facing the challenge of our time, can become centres of glad and confident hope.

In order that such may be the issue of this call, we ask you affectionately and earnestly to set apart the times arranged by your church for these meetings. Be present yourselves. Further; will you make them from now onwards the subject of your continuing thought and unceasing prayer?

The letter was signed on behalf of the ministers by the Rev. H. T. Potten, Secretary of the County Union, and myself as Secretary of the Fellowship.

Meanwhile the churches had all been approached; they were told of our desire, and were asked to make a place for the visitation in their winter's programme. The replies were very encouraging. Twenty-nine churches expressed their willingness to co-operate. They included our biggest churches as well as our smallest village ones, including several without ministers.

When the replies had been filed, the two men who knew the county best were asked to confer together and appoint the pairs to their respective spheres. In no instance had a church any voice in the choosing of visitors, nor any man a choice of church. While local conditions had to be considered, it was suggested that the visitation begin on the Sunday and finish on the Wednesday.

Then the letter given above was sent to every church in the scheme in sufficient numbers to ensure that every member and adherent received one. It was suggested that it should be supplemented by one from the minister and church officers. In many instances this has been done; one or two ministers have sent out a written invitation with each copy.

The churches visited were asked to pay the travelling expenses of the visitors; their own local expenses; and, if possible, to make a small grant to the central Mission Fund.

The visitation was first thought of at our Fellowship meeting, and every arrangement has been made independent of the County Union. We deemed it advisable, though, to have the sanction of the Union, and this was readily given.

Certain modifications of the scheme have been necessary and the period of visitation has had to be extended; at the time of writing there are five more churches to be visited. For some twenty-four churches the visitation is a matter of the past, though its inspiration is felt to-day. In every church numbers have grown as the meetings have been carried through. At one city church 200 members sat down to the Lord's Supper on the Wednesday evening; in a village some 24 took part in the same act of consecration.

It may not be possible to tabulate or measure the final gain; but church life is not quantitative, it is qualitative. We know this: neither the visitors nor their message will soon be forgotten.

STANLEY M. HAYWARD.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

A SENSE OF HUMOUR.

Do people laugh as much as they used to do? Is it still another count against the war that it diminished the quantity of pure happy laughter in the world? Or is it merely that I am growing older and more subdued, dwelling more with care-worn age than with care-free youth, with people to whom boisterous mirth is an offence, and joyous hilarity but a sign of vulgarity and lack of self-control? I wonder.

And I wonder, too, whether the quality of humour has not deteriorated as well as its quantity. A London evening paper has for many weeks been filling one of its pages with war stories of what it has called "Cockney humour": and the fact that the feature has been continued for so long must be held to indicate that it has pleased readers. But if this be the best Cockney humour can do, certainly the Cockney fell sadly below his normal level when on active service: I think of Cockney heckling during the 1910 elections, or of Cockney Boy Scouts to-day. Never a glimpse has been visible (on such occasions as we have read the stories) of anyone with a spark of Sam Weller's wit; sometimes it has almost been as difficult to get through the page as to get through a chapter of A. N. Whitehead! Cheerfulness amid danger and death, heroism and camaraderie, yes—but the humour has been much nearer C *minus* than A *plus*.

And, to judge by two books recently published, apparently the ecclesiastical reader is as easily satisfied as the strap-hanger. One of them, Mr. C. S. Stokes's *And the Laity Laughed* (Simpkin, 5s.) comes from Johannesburg, and is confessedly a compilation. It contains many chestnuts, an impossible illustration on the wrapper, and some frankly impossible stories about J. H. Jowett and others; but it will be relished by many. As good as much "Cockney humour" is its story of the parade service, when Private No. 254 found the sermon extremely trying, so much so that when the hymn was announced, and he heard, "No. 254, Art thou weary, art thou languid?", he scrambled to his feet and said "Not 'arf, sir". The other book is a woeful proof of the decadence of clerical humour. With the title, *Humours of Clerical Life: The Autobiography of The Reverend Simon Simplicitus* (Eliot Stock, 3s. 6d.), "Johannes de Multona" tells the story of his life—for he sometimes forgets he is talking of Simon and uses the first person singular. Here a good many stock clerical stories with whiskers are attached to Simon, and there is little that is new. We have the old minister recently married a second time—a Nonconformist, of course, this one—who thus concluded a long prayer in a ministerial gathering: "And now, O Lord, we pray for ministers' wives. Some men think they are angels, but, O Lord, Thou knowest".

In America it is the general impression, which grows stronger the farther West you travel, that the Englishman has no sense of humour. Certainly the type of humour in the two countries is different, but from America there come indications that the sense of humour has not altogether disappeared from mankind. We not merely have the delightful parables of Safed the Sage—much to be preferred to some recent efforts of Dr. W. E. Barton in other fields—but a keen-eyed observer on the staff of the American *Congregationalist* scours the world's press for the "Risibles" which appear on its last page. It was no doubt an American

humorist who first said about the paper that he read the "Risibles" first and then read backward with gradually diminishing interest! The Editorial comes at the beginning—that is the way editors are treated, the butt and scorn of every jester, licensed and unlicensed (unlicensed of course in the United States)!

Robertson Nicoll once said that long observation had given him three convictions, which he stated thus :

" Everyone thinks that he or she has a sense of humour.

Everyone thinks that he or she is fond of reading.

Everyone thinks that he or she possesses great decision of character."

It was like Nicoll to add : "On the whole these beliefs are unfounded".

Is there anyone who misses so much and is therefore so much to be pitied as those without a sense of humour? The next revision of the Prayer Book should certainly contain a special litany for poor souls who cannot laugh, to whose faces a Punch and Judy Show brings no smile, and Wednesday morning, with *Punch* on the breakfast table, no anticipation of pleasure. Life must be hard for people who never see the funny side of things—and they sometimes make it hard for their neighbours too. For some reason there comes to mind a dinner party at a country house where I was doomed—for what offence in this existence or a previous one I cannot for the life of me imagine—to take in a severe lady into whose eyes nothing would bring a gleam, and on whose lips there was never a smile. I tried my poor best in vain, frantically searching both hemispheres for subjects and securing solace between bouts from the lady on the other side. Then, in the middle of an address on the servant problem, which continued after each interruption, I learnt that distance from the railway station accentuated the difficulty. "When my cook goes to town and returns late, it means a walk of over a mile along an unlighted road, and, of course, she doesn't like it". "Naturally", I murmured. "But now she goes every Thursday, and she always meets the policeman, and he sees her on the road". "Naturally, again", said I. Not a smile, not a flicker; and, confessing myself beaten as the address proceeded, I shrunk farther and farther under the table, to be saved from an ignominious total collapse just in time by the rising of the hostess.

How does a person like that live through dreary and monotonous days, through times of gloom and sorrow? Life without laughter must surely be hell itself. Is it not right to think that God's heart would have been broken long ago by the selfishness and indifference of His children had He not been able—surely it can be said in all reverence—to appreciate the funny side of it all?

For the Eternal to see a man, the puny creature of a day, strutting about dressed in his little brief authority as if he owned the universe, must seem as ludicrous to Him as the cock, crowing as if he had brought the dawn, does to us. Do you remember F. W. Harvey's poem "Ducks"? Here is part of it :

But ducks are comical things:--

As comical as you.

Quack!

They waddle round, they do.

They eat all sorts of things, '

And then they quack.

By barn and stable and stack

They wander at their will,

But if you go too near

They look at you through black

Small topaz-tinted eyes

And wish you ill.

Triangular and clear
 They leave their curious track
 In mud at the water's edge,
 And there amid the sedge
 And slime they gobble and peer
 Saying "Quack! quack!"

When God had finished the stars and whirl of coloured suns
 He turned His mind from big things to fashion little ones,
 Beautiful tiny things (like daisies) He made, and then
 He made the comical ones in case the minds of men
 Should stiffen and become
 Dull, humourless and glum:

And so forgetful of their Maker be
 As to take even themselves—*quite seriously*.
 Caterpillars and cats are lively and excellent puns:
 All God's jokes are good—even the practical ones!
 And as for the duck, I think God must have smiled a bit
 Seeing those bright eyes blink on the day He fashioned it.
 And He's probably laughing still at the sound that came out of its bill!

Perhaps the talk about the humour of Jesus has been overdone lately. Nevertheless, I like to think now and again of the way His eyes twinkled when He told the twelve who had been arguing about place and power that they must become as little children; and I chuckle often as I picture a candid friend with a telegraph post sticking out of his eye proposing to remove the speck of cinder from the eye of his neighbour.

May it not be that a kindly God has set humour in the heart of every man, if only we knew how to break the shell and release it? Perhaps Robbie Nicoll was quite wrong, as confident people so often are. But he was certainly so far right in that many people label a sense of humour what is no such thing. There is, for example, the man with his collection of "funny stories", which he retails over and over again, with growing delight to himself, and increasing devastation to his friends—was it not Hazlitt who said, "We may be willing to tell a story twice, never to hear one more than once"?

I have heard it reported, though of course this must be a malicious slander, that there was once a theological student who, in addition to entering in his notebook the sermons he preached on his travels, entered also the stories he told in the homes of his hosts. The story went further and said that he had lists of such stories written on his cuffs! This must be a marginal addition to an apocryphal yarn, but, lest any should be tempted by this sad example, the advice of old Thomas Fuller may be quoted: "Constant popping off of Proverbs will make thee a By-word thyself".

This naturally leads to the whole question of ministerial humour, the place of humour in the pulpit, and the like. But that must be left for another essay. Suffice it for the present that we let not humour slip from our lives. If men are to become as little children there will surely be light happy laughter in the world again—laughter that drives away dull care, that sees the ludicrous and enjoys it. "Life without laughter is a dreary blank", said Thackeray. And it is *laughter*, not the restrained superior smile beloved of the proper. In that very pleasant bedside book, Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith's *Treasury of English Aphorisms*, I have just turned up the section on "Laughter". Three quotations come together. The first two are from that hateful worldly wiseman, Lord Chesterfield:

"The vulgar often laugh, but never smile; whereas well-bred people often smile, but seldom laugh. A witty thing never excited laughter; it pleases only the mind, and never distorts the countenance."

"I am sure that, since I have had the full use of my reason, nobody has ever heard me laugh."

The other is from William Blake: "I hate scarce smiles; I love laughing".

I am for Blake every time. Let us laugh, and let "distortion of the countenance" be hanged.

ALBERT PEEL.

TWO SERIES.

The enterprise of Ernest Benn, Ltd. is evident in nothing more than the two series, "Affirmations" (1s.) and the "Sixpenny Library," several copies of which are on the table before us. Frankly, we much prefer the cheaper and more general series: there does not seem very much "Affirmation" about some of the others—the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's *Institutional Religion* being a conspicuous example in the last batch. Some of the 6d. booklets are admirable in every way: they are readable, reliable, and form excellent summaries. Of those recently published Mr. Arthur (now Lord) Ponsonby's *British Diarists* is a gem, whilst Professor Conway's *Great Writers of Rome* and Mr. R. Capell's *Opera* are extremely good. Occasionally, of course, there is a disappointment: it is rather too bad of Mr. G. B. Harrison to announce *Elizabethan England*, and then put us off with a mere fifteen years.

ALBERT PEEL.

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

PURITANISM AND THE FAMILY¹.

FAMILY life in England, several foreign observers have often said, and still say, has been something peculiarly good. Especially the period from 1550 till 1850 has been singled out as praiseworthy, and a recent German student has attributed it to Puritanism, a specially English phenomenon. The facts and the theory alike deserve attention.

In the Middle Ages we get information chiefly about the upper classes. In the Paston family it was quite natural for a girl to be beaten two or three times a week. There was a delightful sketch of a mother advising her daughter how she should bring up her children; it includes counsels such as these:—

And if thi children been rebel, and wolē not hem bowe,
If any of hem mys-dooth, nouthur bannē hem ne blowe,
But take a smert rodde, and bete hem on a rowe
Till thei crei mercy, and be of her gilt aknowe.

Leve chylde behoveth lore,
And ever the levyr the more.

And lokē to thi doughtren, that noon of them be lorn:
From that ilk tymē that thei be of thee born,
Bisie thee, and gadere fastē towarde her mariage,
And gevē hem to spowsynge as soone as thei be of age.

Maydens ben fair and amiable,
But of her love ful unstable.²

An Italian visiting England in 1500 wrote severely on the general want of affection, and the especially bad treatment of children: every boy and girl was turned out of home by the age of nine at latest, bound apprentice elsewhere for seven years at least, to perform the most menial offices; the future of the lads and lasses depended no longer on their parents, but the marriage of the girl, the starting in business of the boy, was entirely the matter of the patron.³

Two great changes in England revolutionized both practice and opinion within the century—the abolition of monasteries, and the Family Bible.

Celibacy had been steadily held up as ideal for more than a millennium. Monasteries and convents of monks and nuns abounded, and the community life there knew nothing of wedded life or of parentage; "Brother" and "Sister" were terms bearing an artificial meaning. Into these societies were thrust many girls for whom no suitor appeared, and a few boys for whom their guardians saw no careers; but this spice of young life gave nothing of the real family flavour. Now in England the whole convent-system came to an abrupt end, and, after an attempted revival, it was clear by 1560 that celibacy in the name of religion was obsolete; there was no superiority in a state of virginity.

Genesis disclosed a new ideal, a patriarchal family. Knowledge of Bible facts had been given during the Middle Ages by pictures, dramas, public reading; and all was of selected portions, which did not happen to bear on domestic life. When great English Bibles were chained in every church, knots of people gathered round some one who would seek out interesting tales and read them aloud. The most important new departure

¹ Levin L. Schücking. *Die Familie im Puritanismus*. Leipzig-Berlin: B. G. Teubner. 10 and 8 RM.

² *Manners and Meals* (F.E.T.S., 1868), p. 36.

³ *Italian Relation of England* (Camden Society, 1847), p. 24.

was when at Geneva a new version was prepared, intended neither for the pulpit nor the reading-desk in the church, but for home. In a few years the Scots Parliament ordered every substantial householder to buy a reprint, for use in his family. And England, without official approval, demanded 140 editions in 80 years, so that whereas a First Edition is a costly rarity, the reprints are often cheaper now than a new Revised Version. Among the treasures that came thus to popular knowledge were the sketches of Abraham and his children, petted and quarrelling, Isaac and his twin boys, Rachel the beloved wife, Joseph and his gaudy dress—and many other glimpses at a home-life on a pattern surely to be followed, since it was in the Bible. We may wonder, indeed, that there was no organized attempt to introduce, if not the harem of Solomon, at least the more modest establishment of David¹: conceivably a study of sermons might disclose warnings against polygamy drawn from the stories of Ishmael, Esau, Amnon, Adonijah.

With 1640 the ordinary man was at last free to express himself in print, and the wealth of new evidence at once discloses how obsolete were the ideals of a century before. While the press poured out hundreds of pamphlets on Church, State, and Army, yet there were also Instructions for young men and maids, commendation of wives sending their husbands into the war, and funeral sermons, which throw a new light on the middle classes, especially of London. When the tumult died down, and ordinary literature emerged again, we find that ordinary men now tell of ordinary life. Abraham Cheare, of Plymouth, wrote *A Looking-Glass for Children*; he refers to Isaac, Samuel, Josiah, Timothy, and quotes them as examples:

This Garland, wreath'd of youthful flowers
To Jesus you would bring;
This Morn made up of golden Hours,
You would present the King,
You'd humbly bow without delays,
Grace in His sight to find;
And gladly now, and all your days,
Your great Creator mind.

His verse was written for definite children whom he knew; then, like *Alice in Wonderland*, it was made an inspiration and a joy to wider circles.

John Vernon, once a great cavalry organizer, quartermaster-general in Ireland, had met Deborah Huish in Devon. They settled down in Battersea, with Honour their maid, and reared Caleb, Mary, Betty, and Nancy. When Caleb died of consumption in 1666, his father wrote a sketch of *The Compleat Scholler* which gives a picture of a Puritan home. The maid was a foster-mother, quite one of the family; the toys, the birds, show of the innocent pleasures; and the love of the parents when Caleb was ill is delightfully expressed in their hunt for a squirrel for him to play with. They were not always too shy to say what they felt: "Mother, I love your company dearly"; "Father, you be my dear father".

Vernon was now a physician, his friend Cheare a fuller. In another circle at the same time was a young tailor, Benjamin Keach, who had recently married a girl of Winslow. After ten years of happy life, she died in London, and he published an elegy, in which besides noticing a more public career, he told how she visited him in prison and supported him there; instead of tempting him to use any base means to be delivered, she encouraged him to go on, counting it an honour done to them both, that they were called to suffer for the cause of Christ. He had a second

¹ Especially when we remember how the Landgrave Philip quoted the patriarchs in support of his bigamy; and Luther and other divines did not demur.

wife, of whom her son-in-law wrote that she had lived with him nearly twenty years, and the only possible fault in her was her love and tenderness towards her children and grandchildren. Keach himself at an early age made his mark by his *Child's Instructor*, which he often re-wrote; as the *New England Primer* it moulded many a child's mind in the Colonies.

There were Puritans, in life and religion, who politically were royalist, and socially were of high rank. It is most useful to notice how these contrasted with the meretricious society, pilloried by Pepys and Evelyn, that disgraced Whitehall. Ann, Lady Fanshaw, whose husband was ambassador to Spain, wrote for her son a sketch of his father. She, too, had visited her husband in prison, had learned gently from him that State secrets were not to be confided even to the wife of his bosom. In political eclipse, they had spent a happy country life, sporting, and training their children, to whom he was "the tenderest father imaginable". It was precisely for such tastes that he was presently banned at court, and derided as Puritan.

In the same age we may glance at Margaret Charlton, of one of the chief families in Salop. Her widowed mother, again a royalist, watched carefully over her children against a covetous uncle who in the wars stormed her house and laid waste the property; when peace came, she restored their fortunes, and at the son's majority retired to Kidderminster with Margaret, then about 18 years old. Before long, Margaret fell in love with the lecturer there, Richard Baxter, though he was more than double her age; and, despite his warnings, she persisted in marrying him. Throughout all their subsequent troubles she evinced the strength of her love, caring for him in prison and adversity, gently trying to amend his faults, chaffing him for his hasty speech and abrupt behaviour, and reminding him of his engagements. After twenty years of happy life together, in which her affection was unstintedly expressed, he paid her a fitting tribute in a little biography.

With these actual instances we may compare also fiction based upon fact. John Bunyan's devoted wife, and the little blind Mary selling her father's tagged laces, are well known. He has given a picture of a family when he shows Christiana and her four children treading in their father's footsteps: the importance of Mercy in the story fits with Honour in John Vernon's house, showing how the maid was one of the family. As a contrast, there is the *Life and Death of Mr. Badman*. A grim woodcut bears the distich:

When parents take delight in children's evil,
The children send their parents to the devil.

And of this he gives actual examples. The book abounds in anecdotes of family-life, chiefly such as was below Puritan standard, employed like the sable background to enhance its beauty; there is also mention of good fathers and good masters, with their methods, their failures, and occasionally their successes.

The new ground that Bunyan broke, of the domestic novel with a distinct moral aim, was promptly occupied by Daniel Defoe. He, indeed, dwelt largely on the scandalous side, which doubtless interests more readers; but in his *Life of Colonel Jack* he describes again and again the many domestic problems of home that are perennial.

Defoe wrote also books expressly designed to set forth ideal homes, discussing the relations of husband and wife, parents and children, mistress and maid, master and apprentice. Such attention had hardly been paid to the subject for centuries, and the Puritan spirit is unmistakable in all. Now that this vein of literature had been opened, it was worked by those

who had the ear of the upper classes, and by degrees new ideals became at least known, even to the readers of Congreve and Wycherley. It had been usual to scoff at the Cit, who was to the beau of town just a man to be milked for money; but it was not so easy to cuckold him as the frequenters of the Bath and the Spaw. And however disgusting were the writings of a dean of Dublin, yet a *Tatler* and a *Spectator* transferred the leaven of Puritanism into the mass of society, where it began to work. The manners of a Chesterfield might be beyond reproach, but his morals were no longer regarded as impeccable. A Justice of the Peace for Middlesex could in one generation be known to connive at bawdy-houses because of the favours he received there, but his biographer felt compunction in telling the story. A new standard of decency in the home-life was being adopted, even in the circles of Gay, Pope, and Prior.

The taste for domestic novels filtered upward, and Samuel Richardson both fed and educated it. He was a joiner's son who rose to be King's Printer. But his works were read in society. Whether he told of Pamela, the girl who refused to be seduced, married her master, and won him to a better life; of Clarissa, the lady who did give way, and whose cousin revenged her; or of Sir Charles Grandison, an admirable Crichton who won the adoration of an Italian and an Englishwoman; he threw all his weight on the side of a pure family life. Great as was his influence in England, it was even greater abroad, and a recent German study of this theme places him at the very centre as a regenerative influence. It may be noted how it was the society girl that gave way, the household maid who saved both herself and her husband; Richardson drew from life. What society at large still practised and felt is seen in the pages of Henry Fielding, himself of noble blood: he started deliberately to caricature Pamela, and has left us a faithful picture of life in many ranks. Lady Bellaston was a lady, but shameless: Amelia knows how to forgive even to seventy times seven.

From imaginative literature it is good to stoop again to actual life and assure ourselves of how real families lived. A high-spirited lad named John Collett Ryland was soundly converted, and before long went to study for the ministry in Bristol. Coming from a farm, his manners needed attention, and he has set down in his diary how they were improved. One evening at supper two ladies hinted to him that his conduct to them and to friends he met in the street was strange and stiff. Not only did he jot this down, but he set himself to amend. He deliberately practised finding something to talk about, and then taking his share in the family conversation. And in later years we get glimpses of how, with a faithful help-meet from Warwick, he trained a son who added more lustre to the name.

Another scion of Warwick gentry crossed with Stafford trade was Samuel Johnson, Jacobite in politics, Church in ecclesiastics, imbued with the Puritan ideal of home. If a girl fell in love with Baxter twice her age, Johnson redressed the balance: and little as his friends thought of his wife, he adored her in life and in memory, and, having no other relation but his mother, whom he had loyally aided out of his own poverty, poured a wealth of affection on her. It was under such inspiration that he conducted his *Rambler*, avowedly devoted not to literature alone, but to manners and morals. Even in the novel he wrote to pay his mother's debts, he idealized marriage in the unknown land of Abyssinia. His house was a refuge for four poor ladies, whose idiosyncrasies he bore; and his generosity was required when he himself came to need that care that few but women can bestow. It was a friend of his who described the *Vicar of Wakefield*. Of a real home Goldsmith had known nothing, but this

masterpiece introduces Olivia studying Defoe, and thus we are assured of a definite literary tradition.

Family life, however, needs to be depicted by a woman. Jane Austen has left us full-length portraits of girls in good country families at the time of the Napoleonic wars; she has shown at once the dangers to which society subjected them, and the up-bringing that moulded them. At the same time, Maria Edgeworth was publishing stories that she had told in the nursery, with sketches of Harry and Lucy, Frank and Rosamond, and moral tales for young people. In contrast to these, she laughed at Belinda and society manners. She found some jottings by her step-mother of actual talks in the nursery, and from that hint studied the unfolding of the child mind, embodying her results in a book on Practical Education. Another Irishwoman, Miss Mulock, kept up the succession; she too wrote for children, and when appealing to a wider constituency took such themes as *The Head of the Family*, *Agatha's Husband*, *A Woman's Thoughts about Women*: her work culminated in showing family life at Tewkesbury in the days when water-power and domination by squires were dying, when the rise of a Dissenting miller was brightened by a delightful life in the home. In a later age, the Johnny Ludlow stories of Mrs. Henry Wood, and novels of greater length, turn almost entirely on domestic incident.

If this group of writers be compared with Aphra Behn, the difference demands explanation. It is not simply country *versus* town, it is partly that of another century. And the point is that during that century Puritan ideals had re-asserted themselves, in upper classes as well as middle classes. Court life might be as bad under the Regent as under Charles II, but there was now a healthy public opinion, which could banish even a genius like Byron, and mob even a king on State occasions, because their family lives were held to be a public disgrace.

To see family life at its best, some home of a Dissenter should be recaptured. Boys and girls were not sent away to "Public Schools", but grew up with their parents. In summer the garden with father, or a ramble out into the fearsome wilds of Epping Forest, where mother was well known in the gipsy tents, so that there was no fear of kidnapping. The psychologists had not yet expatiated on gang instincts, nor had chapel authorities sublimated the idea into Boy Scouts and Girl Guides. The family was still the unit, with father to teach swimming, take for walks, and show the beauties of the country-side, or rig up a workshop for his boys' hobbies. Within doors, mother would help her daughters still at the old-fashioned sampler or the newer embroidery, would brush up her rusty classics to make her boy's knowledge of Virgil the easier. When lessons were prepared, she would gather all round the piano for part-singing, and delight them with the songs of her own girlhood.

We often take things for granted, and only realize our advantages when we pass into other surroundings, or when some foreign observer holds them up to his people for an example. It was Montesquieu who gave us the first penetrating study of our laws; it was Bryce who showed the Americans the inwardness of their constitution. Now we have to be thankful that for four years past, a number of Germans have been attracted to the understanding of family life in England, and that at least two of them attribute all that is best in it to Puritanism. With this reminder of what it has done, we may well see to it that however outward forms change, the spirit of the past shall still inspire in modern conditions.

W. T. WHITLEY.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(The place of publication is London, and the date 1929 or 1930 unless otherwise stated.)

Luther and the German Reformation. By JAMES MACKINNON, D.D. Vol. IV. Longmans. 16s.

The Third Mary Stuart. By MARJORIE BOWEN. Bodley Head. 18s.

Three Studies in European Conservatism. By E. L. WOODWARD. Constable. 15s.

Hartley Coleridge, His Life and Work. By E. L. GRIGGS. Univ. of London Press. 6s.

The Man, Charles Dickens. By E. WAGENKNECHT. Constable. 18s. 6d.

Dostoyevsky's Letters to His Wife. Translated by ELIZABETH HILL. Introduction by PRINCE MIRSKY. Constable. 21s.

Mrs. Eddy. By E. F. DAKIN. Scribners. 21s.

Francis James Chavasse. By J. B. LANCELOT. Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

Tucker of Uganda. By A. P. SHEPHERD, M.A., B.D. Thomas Birch Freeman.
By F. DEAVILLE WALKER. Francis Xavier. By EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON. S.C.M. 5s. each.

Love the Law of Life. By TOYOHICO KAGAWA. With Biography by E. M. HINDER and H. F. TOPPING. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

President Masaryk. By C. J. C. STREET. Bles. 7s. 6d.

We should like to congratulate Dr. James Mackinnon on the successful completion of a big task. To write a history of *Luther and the Reformation* might appal anybody but a Scot—one only needs to think of the number of Luther's writings and the amount of Latin and German to be ploughed through—but Dr. Mackinnon has added to industry knowledge and skill, and his four volumes, as readable as they are scholarly, make by far the best study of the period for the English reader. The latest volume deals with the years from 1530 to Luther's death, years it would have been well for Luther's reputation had he never seen, for they brought with them an intolerance and irascibility which can only be deplored, as well as the most discreditable incident in his career—the approval of the bigamy of the Landgrave Philip. The weakness of Luther's character appears most plainly in his controversy with a man like Schwenckfeld. To Schwenckfeld's words, "Although I cannot in all points subscribe to your views or agree with you, I am, nevertheless, conscious that, next to God and the truth, I owe you all honour, love, and goodness, because from the outset I have derived much benefit from your service, and have never ceased to pray the Lord God for you according to my poor powers," Luther replies calling him "a senseless fool" and saying, "The Lord rebuke

thee, Satan, and may thy spirit run headlong with thee and all who share thy Sacramentarian blasphemies to perdition."

This volume, while it reveals Luther's failings as a practical statesman, nevertheless shows to the full his genius as thinker and prophet, for it concludes with Dr. Mackinnon's summary chapters on his character and work. It has recently been the fashion in some quarters to disparage Luther, and Roman Catholic historians and apologists have made the most of it. With these volumes available the excuse of ignorance is no longer possible: while they paint warts and all, they portray one of the most powerful personalities the world has known.

Miss Marjorie Bowen's *The Third Mary Stuart* (Bodley Head, 18s.) is a fascinating book based on the letters of the Princess who became Queen. The letters, beginning when Mary was a child of 9, and continuing to her death at the age of 32, make a charming series. As a girl she was not unaware of the vice of Charles II's Court, and at 15 she was taken from home to make a political marriage with the Prince of Orange. She speedily fell in love with the husband who was twelve years older than herself, and she made him a good wife and a good Queen. Her childlessness developed a deeply religious strain in her, to which the letters and papers written in the closing years abundantly testify.

We opened Mr. E. L. Woodward's book with the expectation of heavy going, and were agreeably surprised to find these essays on Metternich, Guizot, and the Catholic Church in the 19th Century to be as readable as they are thorough. Metternich and Guizot form an interesting contrast. The former thought the middle classes were the danger, the latter thought they were the hope, of Europe. Metternich had a high opinion of himself: he said, "J'ai gouverné l'Europe quelquefois, l'Autriche jamais," but he felt himself indispensable to Austria as well as to Europe. Although he had a sounder sense of the value of scientific discovery than most of his contemporaries, his sense of proportion was by no means accurate, even in his own sphere—as Napoleon said, "il prend l'intrigue pour la politique". Guizot, too, had no small opinion of his own importance; he was always the "heavy father," and often had principles rather than followers. His religion was an integral part of his life, but of the real implications of freedom he had no conception.

The third section of the book deals with the attitude of the Roman Church to Italian Unity, Papal Infallibility, and, of course, to individuals like Lamennais. Roman Catholicism does not come well out of the analysis. We find Lamennais grumbling that in 1832 the men who surrounded the Pope were "ambitieux, avares, corrompus, frénétiques imbéciles," and Dollinger a generation later lamenting that there were more books on religious questions published in Germany, England, or North America in one year than in Italy during half a century. We see not merely that Rome could not think except in terms of temporal power, but that "the change from revolution to liberalism, from rationalism to historical idealism, passed unnoticed; the curia was not even interested in the development of ideas."

Mr. Woodward's is a thoughtful piece of work. It would be interesting to see how far his view that "Mazzini himself was saved from degenerating into the ordinary type of fanatic largely by the influence of the Carlyles and other English friends" could be sustained.

Hartley Coleridge is Dr. E. L. Griggs's thesis for his doctor's degree. It is an attempt to describe the life and writings of the strange and talented son of a stranger and more talented father. With the aid of modern knowledge, both literary and psychological, Hartley's childhood years

probably furnish the explanation of his life story : spoilt, precocious, made the centre of an admiring adult circle : not sent to school until he was eleven : with his father's imagination, but even less able than his father to traffic with reality, only a strong will buttressed by a powerful religious faith could have saved the attractive youth and developed his powers. Had Oriel treated him with more sympathy perhaps his career would have been very different, but from then on he found in drink periods of mental relief and always afterwards lived a wayward, wasteful, purposeless life. The simple folk of Cumberland and Westmoreland loved him, and welcomed him into their cottages at any time, but the drink they gave him in their kindness only accelerated his descent to futility. Dr. Griggs has performed a difficult task reasonably well, but his publishers have let him down by an unfortunate mis-spelling on the title-page, and another on page 9.

No doubt we had better accommodate ourselves as quickly as possible to "*psychography*", both the word and the thing, for Mr. Gamaliel Bradford has set a fashion that appeals to the younger generation of writers. Mr. Wagenknecht, the author of *The Man, Charles Dickens*, is a disciple of Mr. Bradford, and he says that his master's "final claim to distinction is that he has made the writing of men's lives a job for artists at last". Mr. Wagenknecht also explains that "what the psychographer is principally interested in" is not what a man did, but "how he felt while he was doing it". Well, that is by no means easy, especially when "the whole question of success or failure in life"—for Dickens and for every man—"is summed up here : How did his being adjust itself to the Cosmic Energy that fills the world? And how did that much of Cosmic Energy as was Charles Dickens react upon and toward the whole?"

It would be unfair to suggest that the whole of Mr. Wagenknecht's "Victorian Portrait" is like this, for he has given us a readable and entertaining sketch.

One cannot help but feel that the woman married to Dostoyevsky must have been a heroine. The letters published in *Dostoyevsky's Letters to His Wife* (Constable, 21s.) are ample proof of that. Dostoyevsky's first marriage was a failure : after a liaison of some years, he married his stenographer, Anna Grigorievna, in 1867. To Anna the letters in this volume were addressed during the 14 years from 1866 to 1880. The earlier letters show Dostoyevsky in the grip of the gambling fever, feverishly lending, borrowing, pawning, swearing every day that he will never bet again, and then immediately losing the money his wife has sent him to pay his hotel bill and provide his fare home. Then we pass through a period marked by remarkable concern with family and domestic details : "Write everything about yourself down to the *smallest detail*. Don't forget the beans and the bath." From Ems, where he went frequently for a cure, he writes long letters, fussing about the children, telling about his dreams and his neighbours. There is comparatively little about his novels, though we have signs of jealousy, alike in poverty and when he was more comfortably off, of both Tolstoy and Goncharov, of whom he says "Goncharov has only got to hiccough, and all the papers immediately shout about it : 'Our venerable novelist has hiccoughed', whereas they ignore me as though by common consent".

The Christian Science Church—the remarkable creation of a remarkable woman—has probably passed its zenith, but it will be long before men cease to write about Mrs. Eddy and attempt to discover the secret of her achievements. Psychology has of late come to the help of the biographer, even though he does not always talk of "psychography," and Mr. Edwin F. Dakin makes good use of it in his *Mrs. Eddy*, which for some inscrutable

reason he calls "The Biography of a Virginal Mind." Mr. Dakin's is an excellent piece of work, with a bibliography that is exceptionally serviceable. Official Christian Science has done much to try to hide the truth about Mrs. Eddy's early life, and about the inconsistency, instability, and arbitrariness that marked all her dealings—a powerful financial corporation has not hesitated to bring pressure to bear to secure a favourable press—and it is well that a real effort should be made to make known the truth. Mr. Dakin's well-written study helps to this end: he traces the extraordinary career of Mary Baker from the cradle in which she was rocked as an infant to the cradle in which she was rocked in her twenties, and thence on to the rise to power and the pathetic years in which she tried to defy the weakness and death in which she did not believe. It is a long book, but it is difficult to lay it down when once it has been begun.

Canon Lancelot's *Francis James Chavasse* is a workmanlike biography of just the right length. Chavasse's work at Liverpool was preceded by his Principalship of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, and from the beginning to the end of the biography there is the typical Evangelical Low Church note—it is hard now to believe that boys ever existed who wrote about themselves as Chavasse did in his diary at the age of 16.

His 23 years' tenure of the See of Liverpool won "the little Bishop" a secure place in the affection and esteem of that city, and the new cathedral stands as a lasting tribute to his work. Chavasse himself, however, would have strongly emphasized the present Archbishop of Canterbury's words, spoken outside the cathedral after the Bishop's funeral: "This Cathedral is a monument to Bishop Chavasse; let there be a greater and more abiding monument, a Christian city. Go, and remember, and live out the truth which he so long and so faithfully taught you."

Canon Lancelot gives an excellent summary of the Bishop's life, enabling us to see him in the home and in the diocese, and making us grateful for the picture of one who, despite many obstacles, did so much good.

The Student Christian Movement is to be cordially congratulated on its *Modern Missionary Biographies* (5s.), the last three volumes of which lie before us. *Tucker of Uganda* and *Thomas Birch Freeman* tell of two of the great missionary heroes of Africa and remind us of the immense cost in human life of the establishment of Christian Missions on the dark continent. Alfred Tucker had already exhibited at the Royal Academy when he heard the call to give his life to missionary work. Thomas Birch Freeman, son of an African father and an English mother, saw two wives and many colleagues snatched from his side on the Gold Coast almost ere the work began, but with unflinching courage and devotion and unflagging energy he continued his labours. It would be impossible to place in the hands of young Christians two more stirring and challenging books. Mrs. J. A. Robertson's *Francis Xavier* is the second *Life* of the sixteenth century missionary to the Far East that she has written. Our readers have had experience of Mrs. Robertson's skill in describing the life and work of a great missionary, and they will not be disappointed in this account of Xavier's travels and achievements.

We are glad to be introduced to Toyohiko Kagawa, whom Dr. Rufus Jones calls "one of the most striking phenomena of the Christian world to-day". The short biography prefixed to this translation of his *Love The Law of Life* (S.C.M. 7s. 6d.) reveals him as one who shows Christianity as "soul-force, creative energy, redemptive might", whose life is marked by "unquenchable personal conviction, invincible faith, an unconquerable spirit of adventure and demonstration". Born in 1888, Kagawa was disinherited on becoming a Christian. For four years he lived in the slums,

and then he spent four years at Princeton. Returning to Japan, he went immediately to stay among the slum dwellers, among whom he has lived out a life of love and sacrifice. Although he takes a large part in organizing labour unions, co-operative movements, settlements, etc. (he calls himself a Christian Socialist) he always declines to stand for the Diet. All the income from his books—he has written 45—he devotes to his religious and social work. His first book, an autobiographical novel, sold 150,000 copies in a few weeks, and has gone through 180 Japanese editions. He has also published poems, novels, and religious and social works—all this despite ill-health and periods of blindness.

There is no doubt at all that Kagawa is a remarkable personality. The work here translated covers a great deal of ground and is therefore scrappy. There are in it, however, signs of genius: Kagawa is evidently of the select order of mystics, as the first chapter and the Epilogue amply show.

On 7th March, President Masaryk's 80th birthday, Mr. Street's sketch of his life was published, a well-deserved tribute to one of the greatest men of our day. The son of a coachman who was practically a serf, Thomas Masaryk has made himself one of the best educated men of his time, and he has also made a nation. In Mr. Street's words:

"He, the son of a coachman, the descendant of a race of serfs, had in some obscure way escaped the deadening legacy of several generations of servitude, and had inherited the passionate love of freedom which had inspired the Czechs of the sixteenth century."

The story of how the young Masaryk secured his education, stubbornly maintaining his independence the while, and of how he emancipated himself from Roman Catholicism, is thrilling indeed. Getting his foot on the ladder, in the University at Prague and in Parliament, he speedily shows his sterling worth, refusing to be browbeaten either by authority or by a patriotic mob, but insisting, both in the "Affair of the Manuscripts" and the Hilsner case, that truth was the only thing that mattered. His courage in facing unpopularity ultimately endeared him to the people, while his political insight in securing the adhesion of the Allies to Czech independence during the War testifies to his genius. His aims may best be expressed in his own words:

"Not by violence, but by peaceful effort; not by the sword, but by the ploughshare; not by blood, but by work; not by death, but by life and the striving for life—this is the reply of the Czech genius, this is the lesson of our history and the testament of our great ancestors."

When, after the War, the Republic was formed, only one President was possible, the Professor who for so long had laboured with tireless energy and irresistible will. For the last ten very difficult years Masaryk has led his people, and he is President still, despite Bolshevik and Fascist attempts to overthrow him: in himself he illustrates the motto of the Republic: "*Pravda Vítězí*, Truth will Prevail".

The book is attractively got up, and is quite cheap, but there are misprints on pp. 105 and 213.

EDITOR.

The Abingdon Bible Commentary. Epworth Press. 21s.

This book is really marvellous value for money. It cannot indeed equal in this respect Peake's similar volume: but it comes very near it, and its type is pleasanter to read. It is a production of the Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A., and meant primarily for its teachers, both ministers and laymen. Accordingly its editors aim at reducing all technicalities to the minimum compatible with genuine historical scholarship, with a view to making "the religious message of the Bible and its signi-

ficance for our own time" stand out as plainly as possible. But in thus seeking to "utilize the rich treasures of present-day biblical scholarship for practical and Evangelical purposes", Drs. Eiselen and Lewis, representing two of their leading theological colleges, have gone far beyond their own Communion and also drawn pretty widely on English-speaking scholars at large, including not a few who wrote for its predecessor a decade earlier. Among new names here may be cited C. H. Dodd (*Ephesians, Col.*), G. R. Driver, J. A. Findlay (*Luke*), A. E. Garvie (*John*), W. F. Howard (1 & 2 *Cor.*), J. A. Robertson (*Philippians*), T. H. Robinson, D. R. Scott, D. C. Simpson, A. C. Welch.

The commentaries proper fill some 1,065 pages of two columns; Articles on the Bible as a whole (*e.g.*, The Divine Element in it) 90; on the *O.T.* (*e.g.*, The Religion of Israel, by Dr. Wheeler Robinson), 126; on the *N.T.* (*e.g.*, The Historical and Religious Background, by Dr. G. H. Box, The Life of Jesus Christ, by Dr. J. F. McFadyen, The *N.T.* and Christian Doctrine, by Dr. E. Lewis), 115. If, with the exception of the last, the writers cited are British, it is because they will best indicate "on this side" the quality of the work. But besides H. J. Cadbury, B. S. Easton, J. Moffatt, E. F. Scott, and R. W. Rogers, well-known here also, there are not a few other sound scholars, known mainly in the U.S.A. and Canada, who contribute. Some again may be glad to know of H. T. Andrews's *Hebrews* and C. A. Scott's *Romans*.

It being impossible to characterize and appraise such a book in detail, it seemed best to do so indirectly, in terms largely of its contributors, adding only that in the reviewer's opinion it worthily achieves its aim and deserves a place on the shelves of working ministers and teachers of the Bible of all denominations.

VERNON BARTLET.

Didascalia Apostolorum. By DOM. R. H. CONNOLLY. Clarendon Press. 18s.

The special interest and importance of this third-century work lies in the fact that "there is no other ancient Christian writing which provides us with anything like the same detailed information concerning the life, in all its aspects, of an early Christian community". To read it side by side with *I Corinthians* would be an instructive thing, as illustrating the elements both of likeness and of change visible after some two centuries in a rather conservative part of Christendom, *viz.*, N. Syria.

The present, most scholarly edition is not concerned with the contents of the book so much as with giving a critical text of it, for the first time in English. Hitherto the best available has been that of F. X. Funk (Paderborn, 1905), which is primarily an edition of its interpolated form, *Apostolic Constitutions*, I-VI: and it has still the advantage of containing useful notes in Latin on the subject-matter, as well as much of the original Greek of the earlier form, surviving in the later.

But Dom Connolly's contribution has its own special values. (1) He prints a complete translation of the Syriac version of the lost Greek original, with the early Latin version (where extant) on the opposite page: thus the English reader can read the work through in a fairly early form, and check it by another for about two-fifths of the whole. (2) His fine scholarship, both Syriac and Latin, enables him to restore the true text time and again. (3) His Additional Notes at the end, though only ten pages long, add a good deal, both textually and exegetically. (4) His long Introduction discusses the main points of interest; its origin (in N. Syria soon before or after 250 A.D.); its sources; its use of Apocryphal Acts of Paul and of Peter, and of one or more Apocryphal Gospels (I see no sure

trace of more than that "According to the Hebrews", from which he rightly believes its reference to the *Pericope Adulteræ*, the earliest known case, to be derived) and other writings; a special Syrian form of Baptism, where anointing (confirmation) immediately preceded "the washing away of sins" with the water; the Agape, and also a sort of "charity supper" given by one of the faithful; and particularly its most characteristic doctrine, touching the ceremonial part of the Jewish Law as a secondary feature (*deuterostis*).

VERNON BARTLET.

Selections from the Commentaries and Homilies of Origen. By R. B. TOLLINTON, D.D. S.P.C.K. 10s.

This is an excellent idea well carried out. Origen was in many ways the greatest mind of the Ancient Church, but much of his surviving thought is scattered through rather prolix writings, in incidental form. From these our editor has chosen passages such as may enable the English reader "to understand Origen's point of view in regard to subjects which retain their interest for us in spite of changed conditions". A hundred such typical extracts are arranged in logical order under the headings: The Being and Nature of God; The Work and Office of the Divine Word; The Holy Scriptures, (i) principles and examples of Exegesis, (ii) Problems and Criticism; The Christian Church; The Teacher and his task; Speculations and Enquiries; The Christian Life. A good introduction on "Origen as Exegete" makes the whole complete and intelligible to any careful reader. It should be in every Theological College Library for reference, particularly in reading such an account of Origen as that in Bigg's *Christian Platonists of Alexandria*.

VERNON BARTLET.

The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity. By JOHN BAILLIE, M.A., D.Litt. Clark. 7s.

This book grew out of a series of lectures twice delivered in 1927 by the Professor of Systematic Theology in Emmanuel College, Toronto, to audiences of ministers and students in New York. It attempts to give a re-statement of the convictions of Christians regarding Christ, and a rationale of their loyalty to Him, that will avoid the perplexities inherent in the traditional doctrines, while conserving the truth that has made these convictions a saving and healing power in human life. After stating the problem, the author commences his attack on it with a sketch of the loving fellowship of Christians in the early Church: then, refuting theories that would attribute the founding of Christianity to Paul, he adduces the fontal originality of Jesus as the cause of it, and proceeds to draw out the significance of this fact for our view of God, and for the doctrine of the Atonement. Stress is laid throughout upon the suffering and ultimately redemptive love of God as the key to the mystery. The author's attitude to the older doctrines is sympathetic. He rejects Adoptianism, keeps the word "incarnation", and is loth to recognize the modern distinction between saying that God's presence in Jesus differs from His presence in us only in degree, and saying that it differs in kind. At the same time, he is critical and independent, does not believe in being too reverential towards the Church's early dogmatic efforts, boldly rejects the Chalcedonian doctrine of the Two Natures and Anselm's ransom-theory of the Atonement, and is evidently ill-at-ease with the doctrine of the Trinity. "We wonder", he says, "whether we are after all prepared to distinguish

between God the Father and God the Spirit in this or in any formal way". The book may be cordially recommended as a courageous and reverent discussion on very fundamental themes.

C. J. CADOUX.

The Problem of the Cross: A Study of New Testament Teaching. By WILLIAM E. WILSON, B.D. Clarke. 10s. 6d.

The author of this book, who is on the staff of "Woodbrooke", has been engaged for many years on the study of the doctrine of the Atonement, and has already published several shorter compositions bearing on the problem. In the volume before us he gathers together the fruit of his investigations, and presents them in a full and systematic manner. The main thesis of the book is that the old theory of penal satisfaction, which dominated Christian thought during the Middle Ages and down to our own time, is incredible and unscriptural, and that what may be called, roughly, the "moral" theory is the only one that does not collapse before rational scrutiny, and the only one for which the sanction of the N.T. can be reasonably claimed. The other theories of satisfaction, *etc.*, come to grief, not only because they are incompatible with a real acceptance of the love and justice of God, but also because they take no account of the human, moral, and spiritual conditions in our Lord's life from which the death on the Cross resulted. When full justice is done to these conditions and to the teaching of Jesus so far as it has any bearing, direct or indirect, on the problem, the so-called "moral" theory (*viz.*, that the redemptive value of Jesus' death lies in the penitential change it effects in men, not in any change it effects in God, other than what is occasioned by man's repentance) follows naturally.

What is most new in the book is the detailed examination of the doctrine of the Atonement in Paul's Epistles and the other writings of the N.T., and the attempt to show, by means of the most thorough investigation, that even where these writings have been taken to teach most unquestionably a doctrine of satisfaction, they do not really do so, but that the doctrine of satisfaction has been read into them by later readers, their own teaching being really in line with the moral theory and its implications and presuppositions.

It is difficult in a short review to give an adequate idea of the thoroughness and care and scholarship with which the details of the argument are carried through. Even if one could mention other books as full and scholarly, this one would still possess a very special value in view of the up-to-dateness of the treatment. It reminds one most of the late Dean Rashdall's *Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*; but its discussion is, in certain respects, fuller than Rashdall's (*e.g.*, in its consideration of the O.T. background, *etc.*).

There are, of course, things in the book which will not necessarily evoke agreement. The exegesis of Paul, for instance, seems to me in places a little forced: I should be disposed to regard Paul rather as holding some form of satisfaction-doctrine, along with (in essence) the moral theory, which I agree with the author in regarding as the true view. Nor do I think Mr. Wilson has been entirely successful in his treatment of the severe and terrible consequences of sin, and the questions as to how far these are to be regarded as God's doing, and as to the effect of them on man for good and evil. Nor does it seem to me correct to deny the propitiatory or satisfactoral significance in the Jewish sacrifices, which supplied so much in the way of analogy, *etc.*, to the Christian doctrine of the Atonement.

But despite these and some other points of disagreement, I welcome the book as a careful, devout, and positive contribution to a problem central in its significance and perennial in its interest. Not only may it be most strongly recommended to the notice and study of thoughtful Christians; but it is safe to say that no future treatment of the subject will be able to afford to ignore it.

C. J. CADOUX.

The Authority of Christian Experience. By R. H. STRACHAN, D.D. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

It is unfortunate that so many, both of the friends and foes of the Christian faith, seem to be unaware of its modern apologetic, and particularly of the apologetic that is developed by those who hold that the ultimate authority of Truth must lie in itself, and not in any external guarantee of it. To correct this ignorance is the main purpose of Dr. Strachan's well written and very interesting book.

He is familiar with the modern literature of the subject, he faces all the issues with perfect frankness, and he has no hesitation in committing himself to the intrinsic worth of Christian experience as the ultimate ground of this authority. This note is struck on the first page, where he tells us that "experience and authority are not in themselves contradictory terms". Thus he finds a "self-authenticating power" in the teaching of Jesus, which is characteristic of his authority. Again when he tells of the Christian Society he rightly points out that "the real question of historical authority is the nature of the medium which the Spirit of God employed. The organ of the Spirit is undoubtedly the individual experience". So he meets the pragmatic arguments by reminding us that "Truth is not established because it works, but only because it is true". This attitude does not exclude full recognition of the place of the Society as formative of individual experience, or of the Creeds as symbolic religious forms which may be in some respects of greater value than scientific arguments.

In the examination of the contribution of science to the subject he avoids the mistaken enthusiasm which has led so many people to find a spiritual view of the universe in the theories of modern physics. As he says, "that matter has come to be conceived as disembodied energy does not make it any more akin, or less impervious to spiritual power, as Religion conceives it" (p. 154). Dr. Strachan thinks that "the finest gift which physical science brings to Religion to-day is a fresh encouragement to trust our own religious experience".

Many readers will find the closing section of the book, which deals with the authority of Jesus Christ, the most useful of all. There is here a full recognition of the limitations of that authority, which must be recognized by strict exegesis, and by any historical approach. On the other hand, when these things have been admitted it remains possible to argue, as does the author, that a revelation in time can yet be charged with eternal meaning.

We have had many books on this subject in recent times, but the author's wide reading and gifts of presentation, combined with his frank acceptance of his important thesis, will give this one a place of its own.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

The Unity of Body and Soul. By F. TOWNLEY LORD, D.D. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The main object of Dr. Lord's book is to bring out the conception of human personality which is found in the Old Testament and underlies the New Testament, and then to trace the influence of this conception in

Christian doctrine down to our own time. He has rightly seen that the Old Testament conception of personality is that of a body animated by a soul, and that it is therefore very different from the characteristic Greek conception of the soul which temporarily inhabits a body.

In his Biblical work he has built largely on the results of other students, whilst his own first-hand investigations into the sources has been chiefly made in the Patristic period. To this original work he brings several qualities which go to make the book a successful achievement, which will have considerable influence. He has a good style, and his method of arrangement, in both detailed argument and in laying out the whole book, is clear; he gives useful summaries of his arguments at the end of each section, and he is in living touch with the religious issues of to-day.

The general plan of the book is, first, to establish the Biblical contribution, which is done in considerable detail; second, to trace the three great lines of Greek influence upon the doctrines of the Church, namely Stoicism, Platonism and Aristotelianism, which are illustrated respectively by Tertullian, Augustine, and Aquinas; third, to trace the contribution made since the Reformation by science, philosophy, and psychology respectively; and fourth, to note the bearing of his results on some of the practical issues of to-day.

He finds that the Biblical doctrine has influenced Patristic and later theologians even more than we might have expected when we consider the pressure of Greek influences upon them. The legacy which they left to post-Reformation thought was chiefly that of the Augustinian dualism, separating soul and body as two distinct entities, and of Aristotelian "biologism", which came nearer to the Hebrew contribution. The Biblical conception, moreover, finds support from the modern approach, as seen in the scientific emphasis on the body and in the general antagonism of both philosophy and psychology to any dualism.

This careful study of the subject enables Dr. Lord to deal with some familiar modern issues in a fresh way, such as the practical philanthropies of Christianity, the relation of body and soul in worship and the sacraments, and the question of bodily resurrection. Baptists and Congregationalists in particular should note the remark (p. 250) that "if we adopt the view of the body which has been developed in this book, we cannot ignore the power of the Sacraments as channels of divine grace".

Altogether we can congratulate Dr. Lord on a sound and attractive book, which will open up fresh ground to most of its readers.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

Process and Reality, An Essay in Cosmology. By A. N. WHITEHEAD. Gifford Lectures, 1927-28. Cambridge Press. 18s.

This book is the climax of a whole series of very remarkable philosophical works. Professor Whitehead started as a mathematician, and is known as the joint author with Mr. Bertrand Russell of the great *Principia Mathematica*, which is now the fundamental English work on mathematical logic. Then he took to metaphysics, and has poured out a series of treatises one after another, *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Natural Knowledge*, *The Concept of Nature*, *Science and the Modern World*, *Religion in the Making*, *Symbolism: its Meaning and Effect*.

These volumes have produced a great impression on contemporary thinkers. The *Times Literary Supplement* greeted *Science and the Modern World* with extraordinary enthusiasm, declaring that it was the most remarkable work on philosophical method since Descartes, and that it might well announce a new epoch in philosophy. "There is no other

thinker that interests me at present as much as Mr. Whitehead", said Dr. John Oman, reviewing *Religion in the Making* in the *Journal of Theological Studies*. Other testimonies equally significant could be multiplied almost *ad libitum*.

Now, in *Process and Reality*, we have Whitehead's complete system. Like his previous works it is a difficult book. But it is amazingly fascinating, and is worthy of minute and prolonged study. What is so impressive is the cumulative effect of prolonged and continuous thought. Dr. Whitehead tells us that his system is the result of years of meditation. It has the consistency we expect from a mathematician and the speculative ardour of the true metaphysician. There is no doubt that *Process and Reality* is a great book, which must leave a deep mark upon future thought.

The book belongs to the Neo-Realist school. Its affinities are with the philosophy of Bergson, on the one hand, and with that of Alexander, on the other. It is, like both, a philosophy of creative advance. It challenges comparison especially with Alexander's *Space, Time and Deity*. In one way Whitehead is related to Alexander as Leibniz is related to Spinoza. Weber says of Leibniz:—"L'univers monolithique de Spinoza, il l'a brisé, fractionné, pulvérisé". Put "Whitehead" for "Leibniz" and "Alexander" for "Spinoza", and the dictum will precisely fit the relation of the two modern philosophers.

In another way, *Process and Reality* is related to *Space, Time and Deity* as Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* is related to Hegel's *Encyclopædia*. *Process and Reality* is a book severely restricted to metaphysics and epistemology: it does not pursue the application of its principles beyond the point of mere suggestion. Alexander has done this, and so has written the fuller as well as the larger book. Whitehead reminds us here of Bergson, who stopped short in *Creative Evolution* at much the same point where *Process and Reality* stops.

But what there is in *Process and Reality* is of such a nature that at the end we leave off asking for more. A second volume on the same scale containing the concrete applications of the philosophy to the *Geisteswissenschaften* would be enormously valuable. Till it is written we must content ourselves with *Religion in the Making*, which covers part of the ground.

It has been said that Whitehead reminds us of Leibniz. That is because, if for the moment we leave out God, the actual entities of his metaphysic are successive individual pulses of feeling. Whitehead calls these "actual occasions". Each new occasion feels the other occasions previously constituting the universe: some it feels more, some less. What it feels is "objectified" for it as the "datum" of its feeling.

But there are other elements in the universe besides "actual occasions". There is God, and there are "eternal objects". The latter are ideas (in Plato's sense) or rather values, since just as actual occasions promote "physical feelings" in other actual occasions, so values of all kinds can become a "lure" for "conceptual feelings" which can enter into a synthesis with the groundwork of physical feelings. It is through these conceptual feelings that novelty streams into the universe—otherwise it would simply repeat itself. Feeling need not be conscious, and it may have all grades from purely physical feeling to feeling synthesized with the highest values. Its ultimate end is a "satisfaction", which is the issue of the actual occasion: into this the universe as felt and valued by the occasion translates itself. The "satisfaction" then again objectifies itself as a datum for other actual occasions.

What are "things"? "Things" are societies of "actual occasions" with some common characteristic. The world promotes the existence of some such societies. These are "enduring things"—electrons, protons, atoms, molecules, cells, organic bodies. The less complex are simply serial societies, the more complex are also structural societies, in which occasions are strung out not only in time but in space. When a serial society of "conscious occasions" depends upon a structural society for its existence, we have a human body and soul.

God is that unity of feeling which includes originally all the values in strict gradation: in fact, it is the primordial timeless feeling of God by which the gradation is created. But God has also a "consequent nature", in that the whole creative advance of the universe enriches His originally purely ideal nature with physical feelings. "The consequent nature of God is the fulfilment of his experience by the reception of the multiple freedom of actuality into the harmony of his own actualization." In other words, whatever happens in the world is really felt by God as harmoniously valuable, indeed as a kingdom of heaven. But this Divine feeling, being physical, is no otiose contemplation: it reacts upon the manifold actualities of the world as God's love for the world and as His particular providence for particular occasions.

There are many other things in *Process and Reality* besides its central metaphysical scheme. In particular there is a most interesting and valuable epistemology, which shows how actualities are objectified for other actualities in two ways, primarily in a vague causal feeling, and secondarily (in more highly developed actualities) in presentational immediacy. The world as presented to us appears contemporaneous, whereas in the very nature of the case contemporary occasions can never be presented to us—what we feel is always something past. But we take our presentations as representing the contemporary state of what has affected us causally. Mostly this serves, but sometimes it does not. Here is the root of truth and error. Whitehead's whole epistemology is most interesting. It shows everywhere how deeply Einstein's theory of relativity, with its insistence on the *time* demanded for the perception of external objects, even by sight, has bitten into the very warp and woof of modern philosophy.

In conclusion, a word may be added on the value of Whitehead's philosophy to the theologian. The greatest problem of theology to-day is that of religion and science, God and nature. Every philosophy which helps to interpret the stark entities of science in a way that makes a bridge from God and religion to the world and science is a good friend to the theologian. It is not likely that Christian theists will accept Whitehead's doctrines *en bloc*—his doctrine of God forbids that. Whitehead is himself perfectly conscious of its difference from orthodox theism. But his thought will act as a powerful solvent upon some of our most difficult theological problems, and is likely to leave us infinitely grateful to him. Father Thornton has already applied some of Whitehead's conceptions to theological purposes in *The Incarnate Lord*, and it is likely that the next few years will see more work of the same kind.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

The Atonement in History and in Life. Edited by L. W. GRENTED, M.A., B.D.
S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

This book is the joint work of a group of Anglican scholars who can be described as "Liberal Evangelicals." Its purpose is to maintain an objective view of the Atonement over against the late Dr. Rashdall's purely subjective theory, as stated in his Bampton Lectures, *The Idea of Atonement*.

ment in Christian Theology. In that treatise Dean Rashdall maintained that an acceptable theory of the Atonement must fit in with the fundamental teaching of Jesus as it is recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, which is that God freely forgives the sinner on his repentance. Rashdall traced the substitutionary theory of the Atonement to the apologetic use of *Isa.* 53 by the early Church. It helped to remove the stumbling-block of the Cross to say that it was in accordance with prophecy.

Paul developed this common Christian doctrine by the help of the juridical theology of Pharisaism. But his doctrine never took hold of the early Church. The other New Testament writings, such as *I Peter*, *Hebrews*, and the Fourth Gospel, however much they may speak of the sacrifice of Christ for sins, when they come to explain it, always do so subjectively. According to Dr. Rashdall a subjective explanation also prevailed in the early Greek Church. It was the Latin Church which seriously began to explain Christ's sacrifice juridically. Anselm is, of course, the supreme instance. Luther at the Reformation, though a less systematic thinker than Anselm, went even beyond him in juridical theory. But his dogmatic theology is the worst part of his work, and is a survival from medieval scholasticism.

According to Dr. Rashdall the one theory which is adequate to the situation is the moral theory of Abelard. Christ died to manifest the love of God with such power as to inspire men to answering love and lead them to repentance.

Such is the doctrine which the authors of the volume of essays before us have set themselves to controvert. They feel that Rashdall's account is one-sided and unsatisfactory, but in general they do not wish to go back to any strict juridical theory of the Atonement.

The essays follow the course of history through the *Old* and *New Testaments* and the later developments of doctrine by the Church. The statement of the present position of *O.T.* scholarship on the question of sacrifice is to be heartily welcomed. The rest of the historical work is careful, but it does not deal very effectively with Rashdall's construction of the history. One omission appears extraordinary. There is no account whatever of Schleiermacher. Ritschl gets a meagre page.

As a whole, the essays leave the impression that the writers earnestly wish to maintain the objectivity of the Atonement, but do not quite know how to do it. They steer their course with caution between the Scylla of the old penal theory and the Charybdis of Dr. Rashdall's Abelardianism, some verging more in the one direction, some in the other. Not a few of the essays recall what Rashdall says of the later *N.T.* writers—they maintain an objective theory, but their reasons are subjective. Perhaps the mean of the different ideas represented in the book would be to say that Christ died upon the cross to condemn sin as well as to show the love of God to the sinner.

But there is such an immense variety of more or less unrelated suggestions as forcibly to recall Harnack's criticism of the doctrine of the work of Christ in St. Thomas Aquinas with its oscillation between different standpoints: *multa, non multum*.

It is, of course, not fair to treat a book of essays by different authors as if it were the work of a single mind. But the differences of view and the historical gaps inevitably raise the question whether a single work by one of the writers, say the Editor, might not have been more effective.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by NORMAN KEMP SMITH. Macmillan. 25s.

The fundamental philosophical importance of Kant's *magnum opus* is once more demonstrated by the appearance of yet another English translation.

The translator, the Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, comes to his task with very special qualifications. He is well known as the author of a great Commentary on the *Critique*, which has already passed through two editions, and is our English equivalent of Vaihinger.

Professor Kemp Smith very gracefully expresses his obligations to his two predecessors, Meiklejohn and Max Müller, and explains the reasons which have led him once more to undertake the formidable work of translating the *Critique* into English. Meiklejohn had a remarkable facility for turning Kant's crabbed German into something like readable English. Max Müller had not the same gift, but was able to correct Meiklejohn in places where a particular knowledge of German idiom was required. But neither of these scholars had a thorough general knowledge of Kant's philosophy to guide him in the work of translation.

Since their time an enormous amount of intensive work has been done both upon the text of the *Critique* and upon the exploration of its meaning. Kantian scholarship to-day is in a totally different position from that which it occupied in 1855, when Meiklejohn's translation appeared, or even in 1881, when Max Müller's work saw the light. Professor Kemp Smith has not only become heir to a great tradition of scholarship, but has himself furthered it through the two editions of his commentary. He is also able in the new translation to make use of the definitive edition of the *Critique* by Dr. Raymund Schmidt in 1926.

A comparison of Kemp Smith's translation with Meiklejohn's and Max Müller's shows at once certain advantages which lie upon the face of the work. It is commonly known that each of the two editions of the *Critique* which Kant himself published in 1781 and 1787 respectively, possesses an importance of its own. Kantian scholarship has not indeed confirmed Schopenhauer's verdict that they differ fundamentally, but still the changes are considerable.

Meiklejohn translated the second edition, which was quite right, if only one edition was to be presented. Max Müller bettered this by translating the first edition and adding the differences of the second as supplements. But the form in which the *Critique* is now given us is distinctly the best of all. The second edition appears in the text with the differences of the first edition at the foot, except just in one or two cases where length compels their addition as supplements.

This is a great advantage. As to the translation itself, it has all Professor Kemp Smith's special knowledge behind it. It is also very readable. The translator has been very bold in breaking up Kant's cumbrous German sentences, and the result is very good. Accuracy has not been sacrificed, but intelligibility has been promoted.

There can be no doubt that the new translation is fitted to become the authoritative English version, which will be a necessity for all those who wish to make a really close study of the *Critique* and are unable to do it in German.

For the comfort of those with small purses, however, it may be added that Meiklejohn's translation, procurable at less than a quarter of the price of Kemp Smith's, is sufficient to enable anyone to obtain a very sound knowledge of the Critical Philosophy.

ROBERT S. FRANKS.

Individual Psychology. By E. WEXBERG, M.D. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

Dr. Wexberg is described as "the most brilliant and instructive co-worker of Adler in Vienna", and he has written this book in order to instruct the people chiefly concerned in Adler's methods and ideas. His aim is to show their practical application in psychotherapy and pedagogy, and there is no doubt that the book will be very useful in both of these spheres. The writer has much to say about the development of the human personality both in health and disease, and in the normal and abnormal subject. He lays stress on character, and studies carefully the factors which make for character development; but one cannot quite escape the suspicion that he uses terms like personality and character very much in a sense of his own and that his whole treatment of the human subject is much too mechanical and strictly behaviourist to allow for the consideration of either the spiritual or the moral in the true sense of those terms. At the same time his treatment of the subject is so thoroughly scientific, and so strictly based on careful observation and the study of various types that it cannot fail to be instructive, especially to parents and teachers. Its limits are those of its method, but within the limits which its method imposes it is a really valuable work.

W. B. SELBIE.

The Process of Human Behaviour. By M. S. and I. C. SHERMAN. Williams & Norgate. 12s. 6d.

Dr. and Mrs. Sherman have carried out a long series of experiments on the emotional responses of infants in various American institutions, and this book is the result of their investigations. Needless to say, it is a thoroughly behaviourist treatment of the subject, and, although it purports to study the development of personality, the personality in question seems to be almost entirely a physiological product. In defining it the authors say "personality is the characteristic behaviour of an individual. This characteristic behaviour is evident throughout his daily activities, but is especially noticeable in his manner of meeting new situations. We may characterize one person by his perseverance and another by his egocentricities or by his shyness. A certain reaction pattern, although never rigid, nevertheless dominates the activities of every individual to the extent that he manifests definite characteristics in much of his behaviour." That is no doubt true enough, and it is also true that the careful observation of children from their earliest years does show how their reaction to various forms of stimulus affects their behaviour and produces something which may be called habit, character, or personality. What most behaviourists seem to leave out of account is the fact that personality itself, once achieved, becomes a factor in the development of the individual. In confining themselves, as they so largely do, to physiological and mechanistic forms of behaviour, these writers take much too narrow a view. Human behaviour is more complex than a series of reactions to physical stimuli, and even from the earliest years the moral and even spiritual environment of a child counts for at least as much as its physical environment, and becomes more important as the years go on. Educationists can no doubt profit largely by such physiological studies as those given us in this book, but they make a great mistake if they imagine that they cover the whole ground.

W. B. SELBIE.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading.)

The "Clarendon Bible" is dealing with the *Old Testament* in six volumes. Volume III, Dr. T. H. Robinson's *The Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms*, has already been reviewed; now we have Volume II, Dr. Elliott Binns's *From Moses to Elisha* (Clarendon Press, 4s. 6d.), which brings the story of Israel down as far as the death of Elisha. The volume, which is well illustrated, contains Introduction, Notes to Selected Passages, and a Chronological Table.

In *The Epic of the Old Testament* (Oxford Press, 6s.) Mr. A. H. Wood has arranged selected passages in chronological sequence with their historical background. The selection reads very well, and Mr. Wood has added to its interest by printing the earlier passages from the earlier English translations.

Dr. Campbell N. Moody has given us in * *The Purpose of Jesus in the First Three Gospels* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) a very stimulating and suggestive book. He never gets far away from fundamental problems, and always makes the reader ask questions. What a fruitful line of thought, for example, he has opened out in the sentences:—

"For every word that He speaks about the Father, He speaks two about Himself: and what strikes the unbiased reader most is that one whose attitude to the Father is unmeasured reverence and love still presses His own claims with unwearied insistency, and seems at times to eclipse the Most High."

Dr. Moody attempts to disentangle the teaching given by Jesus to the public and that given by Him to the disciples, and finds in the separation an explanation of much that has confused. It is impossible even to mention all the points he raises. We cordially commend the book to New Testament students.

Readers will be disappointed if they expect to find in Dr. Lock's "Westminster Commentary," *The Epistle to the Ephesians* (Methuen, 6s.) a discussion of recent theories. He accepts, with little hesitation, the Pauline authorship, and, apparently with none, the theory that it was written in Rome. Nor is there any examination of the theory that it is a Paulinist Introduction to the first corpus of Paul's letters. That having been premised, it remains to say that the 57 pages of commentary are useful and suggestive, and throw light on many vexed passages.

In *Divine Justice* (Blackwell, 3s. 6d.) the Rev. V. J. K. Brook carefully examines the teaching of the various books of the N.T. about rewards and penalties. He concludes that the teaching of Jesus about punishment is not repellent to the modern mind, the harshness and severity found in the N.T. being due to the survival of Jewish ideas.

One of the most difficult tasks of the historian or biographer is to see men and things in their right environment. It is one of the most difficult tasks of the preacher too: happy is the man with the gift of imagination by means of which he can reconstruct an ancient scene. In *The Rome of St. Paul* (R.T.S., 7s. 6d.) Dr. A. G. Mackinnon, with the aid of Professor Gatteschi's reconstructed photographs, endeavours to show what Rome and Roman life were like during Paul's imprisonment. A reader will be dull indeed if he does not pick up many points from a suggestive survey.

Dr. Griffith Thomas's posthumous book, *The Principles of Theology* (Longmans, 12s. 6d.), carries our minds back across many years to Sunday afternoons when we used to attend his Greek Testament readings. This "Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles" has the same characteristics as those expositions—there is the same fear of Modernism and of Popery, the same emphasis on the Bible as authoritative, and the same type of learning, narrow, but in some ways deep. After an Introduction dealing with the nature and history of the Articles, the thirty-nine are taken in turn and explained and analysed. It is useful to have a book of reference of this kind, but we get the impression in reading it that it has been prepared for a good many years, while many of the historical authorities are second-hand.

Whatever readers may think of the theory set forth in the Rev. Lindsay Dewar's *Magic and Grace* (S.P.C.K., 6s.), they must admire the lucidity with which it is stated. Mr. Dewar's thesis is that "the key to the understanding of magic is the phenomenon known as hypnosis and the key to the understanding of grace is the phenomenon known as suggestion." In arguing the difference between magic and religion, and that irresistible grace is suggestion, and illustrating his points from the life of Christ and the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Mr. Dewar has given us a provocative essay in speculative theology which is worth careful study.

If you wish to know *What is the Real Hell?* (Cassell, 3s. 6d.), Dean Inge and Sir Oliver Lodge, Abbot Butler and Bishop Welldon, Mr. Warwick Deeping and Mr. Ernest Raymond, Mrs. Besant and Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith, Dr. Orchard and Dr. Norwood, and a few others will tell you. They will not all tell you the same thing, but you can pay your money and take your choice.

What we always like about Canon Peter Green is the way he discusses theological problems in the light and language of every-day experience. The ordinary folk of Manchester and Salford are never far from his mind, and thereby his books greatly benefit. *Our Heavenly Father* (Longmans, 4s. and 2s. 6d.) may not in all points satisfy the theologian, but the minister who has to present theology so that the wayfaring man can take it in will hail its arrival.

Prof. H. Emil Brunner, of the University of Zurich, is one of the leaders of the Barthian School. *The Theology of Crisis* (Scribners, 6s.) consists of five addresses delivered in America, the subjects being: "The Crisis of Theology and the Theology of Crisis"; "The Quest of Truth: Revelation"; "The Quest of Life: Salvation"; "The Problem of Ethics"; "Progress and the Kingdom of God." The addresses are not easy reading, but so few of the writings of the School are available in English that they will be very welcome. Prof. Brunner maintains that

"one of the most fatal errors in the history of theology is the identification of the Biblical idea of the Kingdom with the rationalistic evolution and the optimistic theory of progress of the 18th century."

He blames Kant for starting this error, and Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herrmann, and Harnack for continuing it. He concludes:

"Our present Christianity abounds in activities but lacks action. The anti-evolutionary optimism of Christian faith is the true basis of a really active Christian life."

Dr. Lynn H. Hough and some of the more progressive thinkers in America, impressed by the success of Canon Streeter's groups, have combined to produce *Whither Christianity* (Harpers, \$3.00). There are fifteen contributors, among them men well-known in England like Dr.

Glenn Atkins and Dr. Richard Roberts. Also included are Dr. Palmer (the new President of the Chicago Theological Seminary) and Dr. R. H. Stafford (Dr. G. A. Gordon's successor at the Old South, Boston). These names will guarantee in themselves that the volume is well worth reading.

"The task of liberalism is to save the essential moral and spiritual values of religious faith, both from the dogmatists who insist on identifying them with a scheme of thought which has no basis whatever in modern knowledge, and from the sceptics, rationalists, and positivists who insist that man's spirit can find complete satisfaction within the realm of the known."

How this is to be done Mr. R. J. Hutcheon sets out to show, writing in the main for men who feel

"that religious faith is necessary if human life is to rise to the highest level of imaginative creativity, spiritual self-realization, and social enterprise, but insist at the same time that the dogmas of historical Christianity, instead of being a help, are a positive hindrance to the act of faith, which is less a knowledge-judgment than a committal of the spirit to a conviction concerning the eternal worth and the cosmic support of values."

The treatment throughout justifies Mr. Hutcheon's title and his aim.

Dr. G. A. Johnston Ross has called his five William Belden Noble Lectures, *Why Preach Christ?* (Harvard & Oxford Presses, 7s.) "A Plea for the Holy Ministry." Dr. Ross writes with enthusiasm and yet with restraint, and it is gratifying to think that University students in America to-day heard this scholarly plea for the Church of Christ and for ministerial service.

Ministers in all denominations would benefit by reading Canon Jenks's * *Renewal of Life in the Clergy* (Longmans, 3s. 6d.), in which the writer reminds the clergy of the place prayer, Bible reading, and the Holy Communion should have in their lives, and sets before them the ideals of their calling.

Dr. R. H. Charles's *The Resurrection of Man* (Clark, 7s.) is in "The Scholar as Preacher" series. It contains 22 sermons, all but one preached in Westminster Abbey. They are what Dr. Charles calls "critical sermons." Nine of them deal with some aspect of the problem of immortality, the rest with general subjects. We are glad to note that Dr. Charles calls Salmond's *The Infallibility of the Church* unanswerable.

There is a strong Evangelical note in the twelve sermons the Rev. R. Moffat Gautrey prints in *The Glory of Going On* (Sharp, 3s.). Mr. Gautrey's vigorous confidence is welcome in these days when preaching is so often marked by hesitancy and ambiguity.

All that Professor Rufus Jones writes is fresh and helpful, and in *Some Exponents of Mystical Religion* (Sharp, 6s.) he is on his own ground. After speaking of "those aspects of life and experience that do not comfortably submit to the methods of science," and stressing the need of poetry as well as fact, and the "imaginative dominion over experience," he discusses Plotinus, Eckhart, the mystics like Tauler who influenced Luther, Browning, and Whitman. The last chapter is not much more than a bibliographical summary of mystical life and thought in America.

We were delighted to see that in the book just noticed Dr. Rufus Jones spoke of Prof. J. Wright Buckham's *Mysticism and Modern Life* as having been widely read and as having had "a marked influence on mystical thought." We have been equally delighted with Dr. Buckham's new book, * *The Humanity of God* (Harpers, 7s. 6d.), which we believe ministerial readers especially will find suggestive and helpful. Dr. Buckham

is poet as well as philosopher, and he has written one of the most charming Prefaces we ever remember to have read. The aim of the book is "to maintain that the symbolic conception of God as Father offers an interpretation of religious experience and a theory concerning the ultimate meaning of man and the cosmos which is not only tenable but is more rational as well as more productive of human well-being than any other". Dr. Buckham finds that "Our Father" is "the most inherently adequate, moving and expansive name" for God possible. With skilful hand he traces his argument through "Interpretations," "Adjustments," "Obstacles" and "Effects" to the triumphant conclusion of "Personal Theism symbolized in the Divine Fatherhood," in One Who is "implicit in religious experience, discerned by instinct, apprehended by faith, approved by reason, known by love, revealed in Him Who taught us to pray, saying, 'Our Father, Who art in Heaven'".

Canon W. P. G. McCormick's *Be of Good Cheer* (Longmans, 2s. 6d.), the book recommended by the Bishop of London for Lenten reading, deals with the subject of joy.

On the whole we have found Mr. C. E. M. Joad's *The Present and Future of Religion* (Benn, 10s. 6d.) a profoundly disappointing book. Its penultimate chapter saves it, but instead of the thorough and scientific analysis we expected to find, we have a series of popular articles, containing some things that are clever, and some that are cheap. Mr. Joad gives us the usual figures about the decay of organized religion, and the usual talk about instincts and rationalization. It is only in the chapter "Our Duty towards God" that we feel he gets to grips and makes a real contribution. He concludes: "Hence religion in the developed modern conscience may be described as a vague and uncertain intimation of value in the universe, an intimation that is accompanied by an emotion of reverence and awed worship." This implies that life is, in a measure, purposive, and the future of religion is one in which the experience of the mystic will become that of the ordinary man. God is "certainly not a personal semi-human Creator"; He is not the source and origin of life (that would raise the insoluble problems of pain and evil), but the goal and end of its pilgrimage.

There always seems so much in life that Mr. Joad and people like him never seem to meet—a mother's love for a child, a child's simple trust, a life filled with sacrifice, Quakers, Geoffrey Studdert-Kennedy, *etc.*, *etc.* At any rate, they take no account of such data in their writings.

Dr. Leonard Hodgson's *And Was Made Man* revealed him as a thinker with an acute mind and an effective style. His *Essays in Christian Philosophy* (Longmans, 9s.) contains papers for the most part previously printed, but still fresh and suggestive. We wish the essay on "Birth Control and Christian Ethics" could be reprinted and widely circulated.

Mr. Havelock Ellis introduces Mr. J. William Lloyd, a Californian hermit "in the Emerson-Thoreau-Whitman line". *Eneres* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) is supposed to be Mr. Lloyd's spiritual autobiography. It consists of the answers of the old man, *Eneres* (Serene) to the youth *Reksa* (Asker) on "all the great riddles of life".

The Rise of the Christian Church (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.; the parts separately, 2s. 6d. each) is the first volume of a series edited by Prof. Bethune-Baker—"The Christian Religion: Its Origin and its Progress"—each book to form a term's work for boys and girls, and the whole to supply them with a survey of the Christian Religion and the Christian Church. We shall probably refer to the series on completion: at present we merely announce that the three parts in this volume are Dr. Elliott

Binns's "The Jewish People and Their Faith," Archdeacon Hunkin's "The Earliest Christian Church," and the Editor's "Early Traditions about Jesus".

The Bishop's Register (S.P.C.K., 12s. 6d.), in which the Rev. C. J. Offer has collected and translated documents from medieval episcopal registers, should serve as an admirable introduction for research students in medieval ecclesiastical history as well as prove of interest to the general reader. Practically all the documents are from registers published by the Canterbury and York Society. The letter "Drinking Clubs Forbidden" has a modern sound, though it dates from 1354.

Dr. O. A. Marti's *Economic Causes of the Reformation in England* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) bears a title which by no means suggests the contents of the book. After discussing the wealth of the English clergy, chapters deal with the "Revolt against Papal Finance" (1226-1258) and "Motives and Movements toward the Disendowment of the Clergy"—mainly Wyclif. In the last 100 pages we come to Henry VIII's anti-clerical legislation and its economic effects. The book gathers together many relevant facts, but it does not get beneath the ordinary surface sources, and there are a good many misprints—at least three on pp. 240, 241.

There are few problems more perplexing than that of Church discipline. Abrogated for a long time, it is not unlikely that ere long there will be a revival of the attempt to exercise discipline. A summary like Dr. I. M. Clark's *History of Church Discipline in Scotland* (Aberdeen: Lindsay, 7s.) is therefore very timely, and is worth the attention of all called to pastoral oversight.

Social and Political Ideas of Some Great French Thinkers of the Age of Reason (Harrap, 7s. 6d.) is the fifth volume of a series of lectures at King's College, London. After an introductory lecture by Professor Laski on "The Age of Reason" the lectures deal with "Bossuet" (Dr. Sykes), "Fénelon" (Mr. R. A. Jones), "The Abbé de Saint Pierre" (Dr. Vaucher), "Montesquieu" (Professor A. J. Grant), "Voltaire" (Professor J. B. Black), "Rousseau" (Professor Hearnshaw), "Hévétius and Holbach" (Mr. W. H. Wickwar), "Morelly and Mably" (Mr. C. H. Driver).

Miss Isabel Grubb, having already written on *Quakers in Ireland*, has now provided a very informing account of *Quakerism and Industry before 1800* (Williams & Norgate, 8s. 6d.). She shows how the Friends did not share the general religious opinion in the 18th century, by which commerce and industry were held to be outside the Church's domain: rather, from Fox onwards, did they maintain that religion should permeate all life's activities, and insist on a high standard of social righteousness. They did not believe in bargaining, while their views brought peculiar difficulties: thus the Cumberland Friends ask the London Yearly Meeting in 1693 "whether it is agreeable to our ancient testimony against pride and superfluity to make wear or sell flowered printed stuffs, and fringed neckcloths and swordbelts."

Miss Grubb shows how the Quakers dealt with their apprentices, strove to look after their poor, and how persecution, including imprisonment and restraint (often of tools) affected business life. There are many other points in an interesting study which leads to the conclusion that during the 18th century the Quakers "maintained and increased their reputation for trustworthiness and honesty".

In all the excitement about Parliament's rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, we are apt to overlook the fact that other Episcopal Churches revise their liturgies without the consent of Parliament. Some Anglicans,

we imagine, look with longing eyes across the border, where the Scottish Episcopal Church last year brought into use its new Prayer Book. Canon W. Perry's *The Scottish Prayer Book: Its Value and History* (Cambridge Press, 4s. 6d.) sets out to explain the changes made and relate them to previous books. It opens with a spirited defence of forms of prayer as a safeguard against "that subjectivism and individualism which have been the bane of Protestantism". That sentence will suggest the bias of the book, which is, however, of great service in its lucid account of the changes. The "Reservation of the Sacrament" is permitted, while Holy Communion can be celebrated according to the book of 1662, the Scottish Communion Office of 1764, the new book of 1929, or the new English Book (when the Episcopal Synod is satisfied that the Church of England has authorized it!).

Dr. J. F. Laun's *Social Christianity in England* (S.C.M., 4s. 6d.) is interesting alike in its origin and in its contents. A German who fought in the War, Dr. Laun came to Woodbrooke in 1924, was greatly impressed by Copeck, and became a pacifist. He wrote in German a little book on Copeck and English Social Christianity, but when he came to think of an English translation he found it needed so much revision as to demand a new book. Here it is. He asks why Social Christianity has its deepest root in England, and his answer leads him to examine the Catholic and Protestant, the Lutheran and Calvinistic, strands in English religion. Here he is very suggestive, though, remembering the 39 Articles, it is strange to find that he does not give Calvin any place in the forces that moulded Anglicanism, though he includes Old Catholicism, Roman Catholicism, Humanism, and Lutheranism. Strange too is it at this time of day to find anyone saying that on Sunday the Englishman goes to church twice. This book will make many readers long for the speedy appearance of the translation of Troeltsch's *Soziallehren*, which the Halley Stewart Trust has in hand.

Fellowship Principles and Practice (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is the work of the Fellowship Group, and is edited by the Rev. Malcolm Spencer and Mr. H. S. Hewish. A first draft of the book was widely circulated for criticism before publication. The writers believe that many problems of thought and conduct can be solved by "the Way of Fellowship", and they endeavour to discover the principles which underlie such fellowship and to show how they may be applied. In many ways the book is remarkably suggestive, and it ought to be read by all interested in religious and social problems. It does not go the whole way—which we believe is the destined way of ecclesiastical evolution—and suggest that the Church of Christ express itself no longer in great assemblies but in small groups, the members of which can know and help each other and combine effectively for service; but it does show how the group can be usefully employed. There is a good deal of vagueness sometimes when we want something to grip, and the absence of an Index is to be deplored. We wanted, e.g., to find the address of the Regnal League, about which we had read frequently in the book, but it was not forthcoming. When so many people have had a hand in the book it is a testimony to the fallibility of human nature that Professor McDougall's name is consistently wrongly spelt.

In the "Wisdom of the East" series is the Rev. James Robson's very useful *Christ in Islam* (Murray, 3s. 6d.), which gives the references to Jesus in the Korān and in Muslim writers. Mr. Robson has done good service in making the sayings of Jesus and the stories about him available in this form.

The powers of apt description and sympathetic interpretation so evident

in *An Uphill Road in India* Miss M. L. Christlieb has now employed in *Old Stories* (S.C.M., 4s.), nine stories in which she allows her imagination to play round some of the lesser known, and sometimes nameless, figures in the Gospels. We have Peter's boy, the leper who returned to give thanks, and the lad with the loaves and fishes—all of whom are skilfully worked into the New Testament story. It is perhaps significant that the story which appeals least is that of Rhoda, where the central figure is no longer that of the Master.

Readers have reason to be grateful to Bishop E. F. Every for his chatty and informing book, *Twenty-five Years in South America* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.). Little enough is known of the vast lands of the South American continent, and one learns geography and much else from the account of one who has traversed that continent for twenty-five years. Succeeding Bishop Stirling, Bishop Every has recently laid down his work, and his book is an account of his stewardship as well as a history of the Anglican Church in South America. This modern apostle, like his great precursor, is sometimes too carried away by his argument to be grammatical, but his book lives, and men of all denominations can read it with advantage. Sometimes we find it difficult to understand the position the Bishop takes up. On one page (p. 95) he will tell us that "it is true practically as well as doctrinally that without the Bishop there can be no Church": on another that during a three years' vacancy in the See the work went on satisfactorily. Here, answering Mr. Roland Allen, he says that there is no layman in the diocese who could or would act as lay reader, to say nothing of being ordained: there (this in several places), he speaks of there not being enough work for a clergyman to do (*e.g.*, Paraguay, p. 145), even though he has just described the low moral level of the place.

It strikes us that it might be a good thing for Bishops to exchange dioceses occasionally, as vicars sometimes do: we should like to see the Archbishop of York or the Bishop of Winchester as Bishop of Argentine and Eastern South America. It would do good all round!

Dr. R. R. Moton, Booker Washington's successor as Principal of the Tuskegee Institute, has written a valuable book in *What the Negro Thinks* (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.). He tells with absolute candour how the Negro regards his life in the United States, his segregation, his treatment by the law, the railway and other transport authorities, and the public: he shows how difficult it is for the Negro to secure adequate housing and education (with a well-deserved appreciation of the Julius Rosenwald Fund), and how there is constant discrimination in every phase of life. A book like this cannot fail to do good in America, while it may serve to remind Englishmen how unwittingly they may give offence—it appears that the Negro feels acutely the use of the term "negro" without a capital letter, while "the limit of contumely is reached in the use of the word 'negress' ". In a journal which avoids capitals as much as possible we should not have thought of capitalizing *negroes* any more than *whites*, never dreaming that the racial inferiority complex would express itself in this way. Dr. Moton's authoritative study should help to resolve a very difficult problem. The book has no index, and there is a misprint on p. 66.

In *White and Black in South Africa* (Longmans, 2s.), Mr. J. H. Oldham submits General Smuts's Rhodes Lectures to a searching examination. While he yields to none in his admiration of General Smuts as an international statesman, he finds that the General has nothing better to suggest for East Africa than a repetition of South Africa's history, under much more unfavourable conditions. Mr. Oldham proceeds to advocate a counter policy on the lines of the Report of the Hilton Young Commission.

The Challenge of Central Asia is the new volume in the *World Dominion "Survey Series"* (3s. 6d.). It deals with Tibet, Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan, and Russian Central Asia—a vast area of four million square miles with thirty-four million people, in which there are only 15 missions and 150 missionaries. The survey contains a history of Central Asia and its missions, and then some descriptive chapters on present-day missionary work, which come, we suspect, from the pen of Miss Mildred Cable.

Mr. H. E. Winn has rendered a useful service to students by his little book, *Wyclif: Select English Writings* (Oxford Press, 4s. 6d.). Probably many more works have been attributed to Wyclif than are genuine, but even the winnowed list is long enough to be terrifying. Mr. Winn's selection, prefaced by Dr. H. B. Workman, provides a satisfactory introduction.

When religion is mixed with international politics all kinds of complications arise, as we are being forcibly reminded by the persecution of Russian Christians at present. Were the seminary priests in Elizabeth's reign put to death for treason or for religion? The Rev. R. A. McElroy's *Blessed Cuthbert Mayne* (Sands, 3s. 6d.) maintains that Mayne, executed with the usual barbarities in 1577, was a martyr. Mayne was beatified in 1886, and pilgrimages are still made annually to Launceston, where he was executed.

Research students often find as their work proceeds that they have to narrow down their original plan. Miss K. E. Hartwell set out to discover the influence on Milton of the Christian Fathers prescribed in Colet's curriculum for St. Paul's School. In the work before us she has restricted her study to *Lactantius and Milton* (Harvard and Oxford Presses, 13s. 6d.). Mr. A. F. Leach had expressed the view that Milton's knowledge of Lactantius dated from his schooldays. Miss Hartwell has been unable to confirm this, but she has produced abundant evidence, with the aid of the *Commonplace Book*, that Milton used Lactantius, the earliest extract being in *Comus* in 1634.

Under the title *The Solitary Warrior* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) Mr. J. H. Whitehouse prints some new letters of Ruskin, scattered over the years between 1855 and 1880. The letters are addressed mainly to the family of the Rev. A. J. Scott of Manchester, though there are a few others. There are pathetic references to Rose de la Touche in them, and some very characteristic passages. Six unpublished drawings by Ruskin are included in the book.

Mr. Whitehouse has also written *The Craftsmanship of Printing* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.), which tells us how a book ought to be produced. The first thing that strikes us about a survey that contains a multitude of good points is that fewer books than ever would be bought if the price were proportionate to this one! There are 48 pages, 19 of which are blank—7 of them for notes and reviews (a good suggestion this)—and 14 with from 4 to 12 lines of type on them. The type and format are excellent, but the name of the printer is not given.

Mr. Whitehouse urges the use of more durable paper, the abolition of italics, purity of type generally, the cutting of pages, adequate indexes (though he must work at a leisurely rate if he spends "some hours" in tracing a reference in Morley's *Gladstone*!), the provision of a catalogue slip for every book, etc., etc.

All concerned with the publication of books ought to read this brochure.

A volume of Dr. A. C. Bradley's collected essays under the title, *A Miscellany* (Macmillan, 12s. 6d.) is very welcome. Young persons

desiring to become literary critics could do much worse than take Dr. Bradley as exemplar: these essays would suggest to them that successful criticism demands great industry and wide knowledge, as well as a mature and mellow judgment. Here we have, among others, papers on Jane Austen and *Coriolanus*, a most interesting analysis of Matthew Arnold's critique of Shelley's poetry, and a searching discussion of "Inspiration." Not less interesting are the pages devoted to what might be called the collection of materials for criticism—as, for example, the references to odours and flowers in Shelley's poems, or to Coleridge's use of light and colour, and, of peculiar value, the paper on monosyllabic lines and words in English verse and prose.

Mr. Geoffrey West's study of "The Future of Literary Criticism" in *Deucalion* (Kegan Paul, 2s. 6d.), while interesting enough, does not seem to lead anywhere. We have the old Classicism *v.* Romanticism argument over again, and a good deal about some moderns whom nobody will hear mentioned a generation hence.

Mr. H. G. Topsøe-Jenson's *Scandinavian Literature from Brandes to Our Day* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is Vol. IV of the publications of the American-Scandinavian Foundation. It deals with the development of literature in the three countries from 1870, and will prove an invaluable book of reference. There is a selected list of books, but we wish that throughout the text asterisks had been used to indicate books already translated into English: this would have cost little trouble, and it would have proved a great help.

The title and arrangement of Dr. A. Cobban's *Edmund Burke and the Revolt against the 18th Century* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) by no means suggest the nature and the interesting contents of the book, to which the sub-title, "A Study of the Political and Social Thinking of Burke, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Southey" does more justice. The prologue and epilogue on sensational psychology seem rather superfluous, while it is disconcerting to find the first section of a chapter on "The Lake Poets and Social Reformation" headed "Economic Ideas of Burke." But there is good stuff in the book, and much food for thought. It would be useful, by the way, to have determined how far the "world of common life usually lags behind the world of thought." Dr. Cobban puts it at "a century or so."

This volume does even worse than put the notes at the end: it puts them after every chapter. If we must have notes there is only one place for them, and that is on the page to which they refer.

Mr. Harold Herd's *The Newspaper of To-morrow* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) is a useful little sketch, suggestive not merely in its survey of the newspaper world to-day, but in its prophecy of to-morrow, when increased leisure, television, and the use of aerial transport have had their effect.

New essays in the "Criterion Miscellany" (Faber & Faber, 1s.) are Mr. H. G. Wells's *Imperialism and the Open Conspiracy*, a plan for world as against empire organization, and Mr. D. H. Lawrence's *Pornography and Obscenity*, a sex-obsessed plea for "a natural, fresh openness about sex", full of amazingly confident generalizations.

Mr. W. C. D. Dampier-Whetham in *A History of Science: Its Relations with Philosophy and Religion* (Cambridge Press, 18s.) has provided a book of reference which many ministers will be glad to have on their shelves. Modern science has developed so rapidly that it is extremely difficult even for those who had a science training to keep anything like

abreast of it, and here Mr. Dampier-Whetham's book will prove a great help. It is very significant that while 216 pages suffice for "Science in the Ancient World," "The Middle Ages," "The Renaissance," and "The Newtonian Epoch," the nineteenth century itself takes 130 pages, and more recent developments 150 more. We cannot guarantee that the untechnical reader will be able to read all the book with understanding, but we can assure him that he will find it extremely useful when he desires to familiarize himself with recent developments in physics, mathematics, astronomy, anthropology, and the rest.

Dr. S. G. Schmucker is Emeritus Professor of Biological Science in an American Teachers' Training College. In *Heredity and Parenthood* (Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) he has given us a very readable book, which starts with Mendelism and ends with Love and the Family. Dr. Schmucker has the power to put scientific truths into popular language, and his book can be warmly recommended.

The next two books testify to the revival of interest in astronomy. They are M. Maurice Maeterlinck's *The Magic of the Stars* (Allen & Unwin, 6s.) and Dr. H. Macpherson's *Modern Cosmologies* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). Sir James Jeans's *The Universe Around Us* set a very high standard to those who would popularize modern astronomy, and neither of these books reaches it. M. Maeterlinck's, a translation of *La Grande Féerie*, consists of an Introduction and three brief chapters: Dr. Macpherson's is a competent historical sketch of astronomical research.

Although Mr. G. R. Scott's titles occupy five lines, they do not include a university degree, a medical qualification, or a diploma in public health. Nor does the fact that his *Sex and Its Mysteries* (Bale, Danielsson, 10s. 6d.) is advertised as "intended only for serious study, and the sale is restricted to members of the Medical and Legal Professions, Clergymen, Teachers, Scientists and Health and Social Workers" possess much significance. The book is marked by profusion of medical terms and often by a temper which is the reverse of scientific. Mr. Scott is inclined to speak with assurance on many questions which are still *sub judice*, and even when we agree with him—as we often do—we feel his style is altogether too slapdash. Nevertheless, while the book must be read with caution, it contains many useful warnings. For example, there is this further count against war, if Mr. Scott's remarkable assertion in discussing the question of venereal disease be accurate: "*Instead of avoiding infection many soldiers not only welcomed it but made strenuous efforts to become infected.* It is a fact that in Paris and London prostitutes suffering from gonorrhoea and syphilis were sought after and, in consequence, were able to command higher prices than healthy women."

Again, all Christian workers should bear in mind the underlying truth in the following sentences: "With the reduction of sexual intercourse, in the overwhelming main, to what is little removed from a masturbatory process, the civilised concept of marriage, for all these hundreds of years under the immediate control of Christianity's powerful grasp, is visibly crumbling. There is a tendency to polygamy on the one hand and to homo-sexuality on the other."

The 17 years which have elapsed since the publication of the late F. Müller-Lyer's *Phasen der Liebe* in German have produced a vast amount of data concerning both primitive peoples and the marriage problem to-day. Nevertheless, while it is well always to remember recent research and also the difference made by the war in regard both to statistics and to the outlook of women, the work, now translated under the title *The Evolution of Modern Marriage* (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.), has a good

deal to say that is still pertinent. The book has the advantage of dealing in short compass not merely with marriage in its earlier stages but with the difference in regard to it made by the new freedom of women. Churchmen, again, should consider carefully such sentences as :—

“The beliefs of the Church which insist on a rigid confessional and dogmatic morality based on the ideas of the common herd, are declining, very slowly to be sure, but relentlessly Meanwhile the religious beliefs of the Church are being relegated to remote country districts, where they return to paganism.”

Dr. F. A. Barton's *Good Health* (Daniel, 5s.), commended by Sir Herbert Barker, is full of sound commonsense; it stresses the importance of sunshine, air, and water.

A new volume in the “Every Teacher's Library” (N.S.S.U., 2s. 6d.) is Dr. A. Herbert Gray's *Sex Teaching*, a slight, but sensible book which teachers would do well to read. There is a useful bibliography.

The same publishers are naturally making full use of the fact that this year is being celebrated as the 150th anniversary of the founding of Sunday Schools. Mr. E. H. Hayes has written *Raikes the Pioneer* (1s. 6d. and 1s.), and two pageants have been prepared, one by the Rev. W. J. May (6d.) and the other by John Oxenham and Dr. R. Dunkerley (8d.). Mr. Hayes is also the author of *Chalmers of Papua* (N.S.S.U., 1s.).

The third series of Professor C. F. Rogers's *Lectures in Hyde Park* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.) deals with “Christianity and Conduct” under the headings “Rights and Duties,” “Poverty and Waste,” “Betting and Gambling,” “Divorce and ‘Re-marriage,’ ” and “Why Men do not go to Church.”

We have frequently found Mr. Archer Wallace's biographies useful for Scouts' Parade Services and the like, and we welcome another one, *Heroes of Peace* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), the heroes ranging from Col. Lindbergh to George Müller.

Mr. R. A. Bush's *Jesus Christ at Work* (Manchester: Two Worlds Publishing Co., 4s. 6d.) is “A selection from a series of communications upon many subjects from the spiritual side of life”. These communications came *via* the Ouija board. Mr. Bush believes that the human race cannot be saved so easily as by “a single tragedy enacted 19 centuries ago. . . . The redemption of man consists in assisting the evolution of latent divine elements”, a “stupendous enterprise worthy of a god”, which is now the work of the Son of God who came on earth in the body of Jesus. Mr. Bush seems to be on right lines in endeavouring to persuade Spiritualists (wrongly spelt on p. 110) to acknowledge the leadership of Jesus, but we cannot say we are impressed by these conversations. All kinds of people speak, including the author's parents, a grand-child who died at the age of one year, Levi (a contemporary of Jesus), a Roman soldier, a monk, an Elizabethan courtier, a Duke of Devonshire, and an Irish Fenian. We cannot think communications of this nature will convert any non-Spiritualist.

Sir Oliver Lodge's *Conviction of Survival* (Methuen, 2s.) is more convincing, at any rate in so far as it strengthens the impression conveyed in his words, “there is a vague notion abroad that there is something in it”. The booklet contains two addresses in memory of F. W. H. Myers, one delivered after Myers's death in 1901, the other last year as the first of a series of Myers Lectures, which are to be given biennially. In addition there is a list of Myers's Signed Contributions to the *Proceedings* and *Journal* of the Society for Psychical Research.

Father Ronald Knox is one of the best of our satirists, but he is inclined to let his gifts run away with him. If satire could help religion, he would be in the front rank of Christian apologists, but we doubt if satire helps the Church any more than sarcasm helps the teacher. In *Caliban in Grub Street* (Sheed & Ward, 7s. 6d.) Father Knox has given himself the easy task of satirizing the symposiasts—the writers of articles on religious subjects in the daily and weekly press. It is all very entertaining and often very effective, as when the modern craze for making religion easy and pleasant receives deserved castigation. Mr. Arnold Bennett is treated comparatively lightly, though his inconsistencies make Father Knox ask him to

“keep his religious convictions filed somewhere on a card-index, so that his secretary may have easy access to them when occasion arises.”

As may be expected, Father Knox is specially severe on the Spiritualists, though he probably speaks for many in saying that he will

“take an interest in Spiritualism when the spirits can manage to produce a poem that is worth reading, or a statement that is not obvious, or a truth we did not know before which afterwards is verified.”

Mr. John Eppstein's *Ten Years' Life of the League of Nations* (Mayfair Press, 7s. 6d.) is a useful and well illustrated record of the origins, history, and work of the League to date. Lord Cecil contributes a Foreword, and Professor Gilbert Murray an Epilogue, while leaders of the League movement introduce the sections in which Mr. Eppstein deals with selected activities of the League.

Mr. H. Wilson Harris's *Naval Disarmament* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) is a clear and readable statement of the problem before the Five Power Conference, published on the day of the opening of that Conference. It is interesting to note that Mr. Harris would accept a Mediterranean Locarno—Britain accepting the responsibility of coming to the help of France or Italy in case of attack by the other—if that would remove opposition to disarmament.

Herr Jacob Wassermann is slowly but surely making his way in England as one of the first, if not the first, of German novelists. We have already commended his charming story, *The Triumph of Youth*, and written enthusiastically about that remarkable novel, *The World's Illusion*. The new book, *The Mauritius Case* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.), is not, we think, quite up to the level of *The World's Illusion*, but it is nevertheless an extremely powerful story. Some of Waremmé's experiences in the United States are hardly germane to the narrative, and seem to be introduced merely in order to praise Hull House, Chicago, work which is now above all praise. The analysis of various characters, the judge and his son, the prisoner and his father, is masterly. The women do not seem quite so well done as the men.

Mr. J. A. Steuart, having previously used Robert Louis Stevenson as the subject for a novel, in *The Immortal Lover* (Harrap, 7s. 6d.) writes a “romance” about the story of Burns. In the main Mr. Steuart sticks closely to the facts of Burns's life, and many of the women who came into it find a place in his pages, but with the denouement known and no surprises possible, the novelist labours under considerable handicaps. And when all is said and done, one always feels that Burns is much more to be blamed than pitied.

Turn Back the Leaves (Macmillan, 7s. 6d.) is the best work of Miss E. M. Delafield's that we have met. It is the story of the effect of repression on the members of a Roman Catholic household, and it is

extremely well-told. We do feel, however, that Miss Delafield lets her readers down rather badly at the end. She seems to have been afraid of a conventional happy ending for anybody, and we are left wondering what happened to several of the interesting people whose lives we have been following.

The Lost Child (Gollancz, 7s. 6d.), by Rahel Sanzara (said to be "a well-known German actress") is translated from the German. It is a remarkably uneven book, giving the impression of beauty, reality, and power in some parts, and subsiding in others to a mediocrity in which the strings pulling the marionettes are very evident. It is the story of how Fritz, the abnormal child of lust, is seized with paroxysms of rage and passion that are uncontrollable, in one of which he brutally murders the four-year-old child of his master. The story follows its unconvincing course through his fifteen years' imprisonment, and then on to his death. The novel is as difficult to evaluate as it is to classify.

We hope that the success of one or two war novels and plays is not going to produce a spate of horrors. We are sorry that Mr. Vernon Bartlett has seen fit to perpetrate a study in the macabre (*No Man's Land*, Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.). The first 100 pages of the book consist of vignettes in the life of a boy and youth until the war arrives. Then come 230 pages in which the hero lies severely wounded in a shell hole after an early morning raid, going over his past life, attempting to crawl back to the lines in the dusk only to be killed by the fire of his comrades.

Some years ago there seems to have been a war between the United States and Germany, in which some other nations were involved. This war is described by Miss Mary Lee in *It's a Great War* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.), a novel which has won a prize of £2,500. Miss Lee is, of course, an American. She spent two years in France in a base hospital at Bordeaux, with the Air Service in Paris, and as a Y.M.C.A. canteen worker near the Front, and then went on to Germany with the Army of Occupation. It is on these experiences that she draws in a book at once able and vivid, in which we see how, even more in the seven men behind the Front than in the eighth man at the Front, war destroys all that is best in man. Here we see, too, the effect on men of absence from the life of home and "people"—Miss Lee shirks nothing in describing the breakdown of sexual morality. The book is an American *All Quiet on the Western Front* from a woman's point of view. It reveals and it scorches: at times it is almost too painful to read—and Christians will not find it least so in the part played by religion: there is nothing but contempt and scorn for the representatives of religion in the book, be they chaplains or Y.M.C.A. workers. We wonder if the account of the Y.M.C.A. man who scrounged the morning egg that someone sent in for Anne, ill in bed near the front line, can really be based on fact? Well, nobody will be able to talk about "War, the purifier," when the novelists have done with it.

EDITOR.

The best part of Mr. H. J. Schonfield's *The Lost "Book of the Nativity of John"* (Clark, 5s.) is its Introduction on the Baptist in relation to the Messianic Hope of the Kingdom of God. Beyond that, its thesis is a mare's nest, due ultimately to an oversight in reading two crucial passages, one in Isho'dad, the other in the *Book of James*, as though their writers thought of John as the destined Messiah, whereas they mean only that "the Jews," in the one case, and Herod in the other, so thought when in *John's infancy* Herod was slaying the Babes of Bethlehem. Pity that so it should be; for the author has spent much time and pains on his argument, and may involve some few in his mistaken conclusions. All that is

historical in his materials is derived from the Gospel Nativities: as re-applied later on—not primarily to John at all, but to the martyrdom of his father Zacharias, taken as meant in *Luke* 11⁵¹—they became pure fiction.

VERNON BARTLET.

The late Canon E. R. Bernard, for twenty-three years Chancellor of Salisbury, was exactly the type of culture which the English Cathedral close can produce, when it is at its best. He was a Harrow boy, at Exeter College, and a Fellow of Magdalen; then in country parsonages, and old-world south country towns; he never knew anything like the shattering life of Lancashire. The volume *Sermons and Lectures* (Cambridge Press, 6s.) contains "gleanings" from Bernard's more than fifty years' ministry. Very good gleanings they are. The twelve sermons, and the series of lectures on "The Litany", "Hymns", "The Atonement", are the work of a quiet mind, very rich in thought, deeply religious, breathing the spirit of the older classical schools rather than of modern science. One of the lectures on Hymns is on Watts and Wesley; it is a very generous tribute, especially to Watts, and to the lead Congregationalists gave in English hymnology. This is a delightful book to have in days like these: it is not a "catching" book, as commonly understood; but it is genuinely a book. It is full of the real and mature work of a complete Christian scholar. Canon Bernard died in 1921; the book has not been published hurriedly.

Prof. J. Y. Simpson's *Nature: Cosmic, Human, and Divine* (Milford, 6s.) contains three lectures delivered at Yale in 1929. In contrast to Canon Bernard, here is modern science in full feather, flourishing and ambitious; but rightly not too confident of itself. The first lecture is based largely on Sir James Jeans's *Astronomy and Cosmology*, and on Prof. Eddington's recent Gifford Lecture; it is a very good summary of the present situation in Physics. The second deals with evolution in the organic frame, and with the age and place of man in the universe. In the third Prof. Simpson turns philosopher, and, to some extent, theologian; his argument savours of General Smuts, in his *Holism and Evolution*. The science will be very useful to the general reader. In the last lecture Prof. Simpson suggests there should be in every theological college a chair held by a layman thoroughly equipped in natural science. I say, "Yea, and Amen": and would to God there were a trained theologian in every science school!

The Rev. G. A. Ferguson's *Outlines of a Christian Philosophy* (Williams & Norgate, 7s. 6d.) is an outline of a philosophy in Christian terms, in which the author "sets forth a rational explanation of the Universe." This is a large subject, to which Mr. Ferguson brings considerable reading and experience.

Miss Gertrude Leigh's *New Light on the Youth of Dante* (Faber & Faber, 15s.) is a very able study of the *Inferno*, Cantos 3—13, with the purpose of tracing underneath the figures of the poem most distinct references by Dante to the decisive incidents in his early life, and in the opening of his mind. Miss Leigh believes that the *Inferno* is, on its theological side, a piece of elaborate irony, aimed at the Roman dogmas about hell; that on the surface the *Inferno* seems to accept these dogmas, because the Inquisition made it dangerous for any other view to be held, but that in fact it is a veiled satire of these dogmas. On the historical point Miss Leigh makes out remarkably interesting parallels between the poem and Dante's youth. There is, of course, a strong autobiographical vein in the *Commedia*; but it is possible on this line to try to prove too much. Whether

the *Inferno* is meant ironically seems a more difficult matter. Certainly Dante was not a too orthodox Roman, nor any sort of friend of the Papacy in its moral and political degradation. The meaning of the *Inferno* seems to be much more the poet's vision of the issues which are at stake in human life, and of the alternatives which face every living soul. Somehow one feels that there is far less irony in these tremendous Cantos than Miss Leigh seems to find there. But Miss Leigh has written a book which deserves, and will repay, careful study. It is the work of a Dante scholar who has poetical insight.

Those who revel in technical matters like metre, accent, and the rest of the bricks and mortar of poetry, will greatly enjoy Miss Katharine M. Wilson's *The Real Rhythm in English Poetry* (Aberdeen Univ. Press, 7s. 6d.). Briefly the aim of the book is a collation of the prosodies of music and poetry. I do not know quite what Mr. Saintsbury has done, but he is in for it badly, once Miss Wilson gets going about his views of prosody. Mr. Saintsbury seems to have said he knows nothing about music, and almost to have implied that what Miss Wilson is talking about is largely nonsense. Anyhow, it is very interesting to read. Miss Wilson writes a good slinging style, and is not the least bit suffocating. She has an ear for the inner meaning of poetry. This is a quite delightful book: and just when things are getting a little heavy, there is a flash like this in the sky—"but prosody at its best is a blasphemous art wearing its shoes in the sanctuary."

A. T. S. JAMES.

Dr. W. Tudor Jones is already well known as a writer on philosophical and religious themes. Many will remember him as the English interpreter of Eucken. *The Reality of the Idea of God* (Williams & Norgate, 6s.) does not name Eucken, but it suggests Eucken's manner of philosophizing—learned, and sympathetic towards all that is good, but somewhat vague. Many things are thought to be converging towards theistic belief, at the present fortunate hour. And, on a broader view, successive phases in the uncompleted process of man's biological and spiritual evolution—significant knowledge; significant values; significant religions—will all find their crown in an assured belief in God.

It may be worth adding that Dr. Jones sometimes expresses himself like a foreigner. P. 7: "The various branches of knowledge have the tendency of forming a completeness. . . . My attempt intends to show . . .". This is a fair sample of many sentences in the book; and it is not English idiom.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS.

J. N. FARQUHAR. *Modern Religious Movements in India*. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

A. SCHWEITZER. *Civilization and Ethics*. Black. 10s. 6d. 2nd ed., rev.

The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867-1920. Compiled under the direction of Archbishop Lord Davidson. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d. Pub. in 1920; now issued with an Appendix containing the Report of the 1920 Conference.

G. G. COULTON. *Life in the Middle Ages*. Vol. IV. "Monks, Friars, and Nuns." Cambridge Press. 10s. 6d. The 4 vols. were pub. in 1910 in one volume. Vol. IV has now been increased by 100 pp.

BAEDEKER. *Rome and Central Italy*. (16th rev. ed.); *Northern Italy including Florence* (15th rev. ed.). Allen & Unwin. 16s. each. Timely reprints.

- R. LYND. *Books and Authors*. Cape. 3s. 6d. "Travellers' Library."
 LEO TOLSTOY. *Childhood, Boyhood and Youth; What is Art? and Essays on Art*. Oxford Press. 3s. 6d. and 2s. "World's Classics." Translated by Mr. Aylmer Maude.

ALSO RECEIVED.

- The New Testament (R.V.)*. Oxford Press (World's Classics). 2s.
The Old Testament. Selected Passages (Parts II and III of *The Children's Bible*. Cambridge Press. 1s. 9d.
 W. C. CHANNON. *A Year's Bible Readings for Mothers of Little Children*. N.S.S.U. 1s.
General Epistles (Studies by Dr. A. J. Gossip and Dr. J. F. McFadyen); *Revelation* (Studies by the Archbishop of Armagh and Dr. A. S. Peake). "The Study Bible." Cassell. 3s. 6d. each.
 H. M. HAIN. *Thy Word is Truth*. A Collection of Tributes to the Bible. Simpkin. 1s. 6d.
 R. LEE. *The Outlined John*. Blackboard Outlines. Pickering. 3s.
 C. F. HOGG and W. E. VINK. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*. A Commentary. Pickering. 4s. 2nd edition.
 H. J. FLOWERS. *The Practice of Prayer*. Stockwell. 2s. 6d.
 T. EDMUND HARVEY. *Along the Road of Prayer*. Friends' Book Centre. 1s. 6d.
 ALBERT MITCHELL. *The Faith of an English Churchman*. Longmans. 2s. 6d.
 FRANCIS UNDERHILL. *My Duty towards My Neighbour*; D. MORSE-BOYCOTT, *The Pilgrim's Way*. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 2s. 6d. each. "Handbooks of Religion" Series.
 N. T. MACDONALD. *Dawn Beyond the Sunset*. Epworth Press. 5s.
 REES GRIFFITH. *Reserves of the Soul*. Stockwell. 2s. 6d.
 SPENCER H. ELLIOTT. *The Romance of Marriage*. S.P.C.K. 1s.
 T. L. JARMAN. *William Marshall, First Earl of Pembroke*. Blackwell. Stanhope Prize Essay, 1929. A competent piece of work.
 E. R. PITMAN. *Lady Missionaries in Many Lands*. Pickering. 2s.
 A. LE FEUVRE. *Herself and Her Boy*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.
 L. A. B. SNOW. *Eldwyth's Choice*. Pickering. 2s. 6d.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The Holborn (January). Prof. Humphries and Dr. Wardle have now assumed the editorship. This issue is a memorial volume to Dr. Peake, with tributes from far and near. An important article is Prof. Burkitt's "Twenty-Five Years of Theological Study," while the Rev. G. G. Hornby writes interestingly on "The Nonconformist Minister in Fiction."

The Hibbert (January). Dr. W. R. Matthews discusses "The Destiny of the Soul" and Prof. F. M. Cornford "The Division of the Soul." Sir Francis Younghusband writes on "The Faith of the Future," which "will be faith in the goodness of things—faith that the world is governed for good." There is a very interesting Jewish Christian Symposium, two papers read at the conference of Jews and Christians by Mr. C. G. Montefiore and Professor Burkitt. Among other articles are Baron von Oppell's "The Reality of Beauty," Mr. Robert Swann's "Beauty and the Machine" and Canon Lacey's "The Place of Authority in Religion." Dr. Moffatt's "Survey of Recent Theological Literature" appears in this issue.

The London Quarterly (January). There are tributes to Dr. Peake from Dr. W. F. Howard and Dr. W. F. Lofthouse. Dr. Howard also contributes a very serviceable survey of recent German work on the New Testament. Dr. J. G. Tasker has an article on Luther and Dr. A. S. Way an interesting contribution on "Food-Hygiene of the Middle Ages," written round Michael Scott's *Mensa Philosophica*. The Rev. A. M. Chirgwin tells of Canada's four years' experience of the United Church.

The Baptist Quarterly (January). The "Reminiscences of the Rev. John Aldis of Maze Pond" are by his son. Dr. Whitley discusses "The Influence of Whitefield on Baptists" and the Rev. Ernest Payne pleads for more interest in and concern for Baptists on the Continent.

The Modern Churchman (December-February). This journal is always interesting, as might be expected when frequent contributors are Dr. W. R. Matthews, the Bishop of Birmingham, and the Rev. J. S. Bezzant. At present a discussion is proceeding in regard to the consistency of the Bishop of Durham.

The Church Quarterly Review (January). Automatically we took the paper-knife when we picked up this journal, but find to our pleasure that for the first time the pages are cut for us—a decided improvement. Canon Jenkins writes very interestingly on "Bishop Creighton's View of History." Miss Phyllis Doyle needs to be warned that Dr. R. G. Usher is not always a reliable historian. The Rev. R. N. Carew Hunt's subject is "Paolo Sarpi" and Dr. Montgomery Hitchcock's "The Charges against the Christians in Tacitus." There is a characteristic article by Mr. W. H. Jacobsen on "Rationality and Mysticism"; the Archdeacon of Worcester is extremely critical of the Report of the Commission on Religious Education, but he is nothing like so "sniffy" and superior as Prof. Relton in his reviews of *The Lord of Life* and Prof. Angus's *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*.

The Expository Times (December-February). In the "Books that have influenced our Epoch" series Dr. J. A. Robertson discusses Dr. Glover's *Jesus of History*. The contributors to a series on "The Words from the Cross" are the Rev. James Reid, Dr. W. M. Macgregor, and Dr. A. J. Gossip. In considering "The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day" Mr. H. G. Wood deals with Socialism and Canon Peter Green with Gambling.

The Friends' Quarterly Examiner (First Month). Several of the papers discuss the work and witness of the Society of Friends to-day, among them "From the House of the Four Winds," Mr. Arthur Rowntree's "The Problem Cardinal and Urgent" and Mr. J. S. Hoyland's "The Present Need of the Society of Friends." There is also an address by Sir George Newman on "The Application of Quaker Principles in Medical Practice."

The Review of the Churches (January). To this number, devoted almost entirely to the Reunion proposals in South India, we refer in the editorial. Sir Henry Lunn has secured representative contributors on all sides. He also examines Canon Streeter's *The Primitive Church*.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library (January). There are tributes to Dr. Peake, Prof. T. F. Tout, and Mr. J. Goodier Haworth, and accounts of the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the Manchester Theological Faculty. The Editor and Dr. Mingana speak with deserved severity of a charge of forgery brought against the Library by two Jesuit writers. The Bulletin is of real service to learning. We wish the Editor's words on "Safeguarding Manuscript Sources" could be broadcast. Dr. Mingana prints the text and translation of a Syrian MS. of the "Apocalypse of Peter."

The British Journal of Inebriety (January). The major part of this issue is occupied by Sir Josiah Stamp's lecture "Alcohol as an Economic Factor." We wish all temperance reformers would study this lecture, for so much of their propaganda is vitiated by being altogether unscientific.

The International Review of Missions (January). Over 70 pages are devoted to the survey of 1920, and very informing and valuable it is. Dr. Reischauer writes on "Christianity and Woman's Higher Education in Japan" and Prof.

Lootfy Levonian on "The Criticism of Religion in Islam"—it is not only Christianity that it undergoing a sea-change at the present time. ●

World Dominion (January). The Rev. Roland Allen's "The Place of Medical Missions" deserves the attention of all missionary workers. The Rev. Kendal Gale tells of the difficulties of the work in Madagascar; Miss Olive Wyon writes on "The Cross in Arabia", and Dr. J. W. Lindsay on the "Life of a Non-Professional Missionary", describing his experiences in Paraguay where he has been in practice for nearly 80 years.

The Evangelical Quarterly (January). Dr. G. Ch. Aalders discusses "The Turn of the Tide in Pentateuchal Criticism" and Dr. A. McCaig "The Use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch." Dr. Doumergue's subject is "What is Protestantism" and Dr. MacLean's "The Counter-Reformation in Scotland." The Fundamentalist outlook is obvious, both in the review sections and in the articles.

"Service" (January). This is the first number of the "Organ of the Civil Service Christian Union"—6d. per annum. We hope that the Christian Church has something better to offer to young people engaged in the Civil Service than this magazine. One or two brief articles dealing with practical life, like that on the London City Mission, are useful, but the rest of the magazine is so conservative and stodgy that we cannot imagine any young person under 75 reading it through.

The Harvard Theological Review (Oct.-Jan.). An extremely useful service to students is rendered in the Oct. issue by Prof. Luigi Salvatorelli who surveys the Historical Investigation of the Origins of Christianity from Locke to Reitzenstein. This occupies over 100 pages. The remaining article is Dr. G. F. Moore's "Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies According to Josephus." The main articles in Jan. are Mr. J. S. Bixler's "Men and Tendencies in German Religious Thought", Dr. R. Dunkerley's "The Oxyrhynchus Fragments", and Mr. R. P. Casey's "The Athens Text of Athanasius's *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*".

The Princeton Theological Review (July). This is the last number of this Review, possibly Dr. Allis's removal from Princeton being one of the causes of its cessation. We can only regret that so much industry and learning have been employed in bolstering up views of the Bible and of the Christian Religion that are no longer tenable. In this number we have the conclusion of Dr. W. B. Greene's "The Ethics of the Old Testament" and Mr. A. B. Dodd's "Primary Requisites for the Speedy Evangelization of China."

The Yale Review (Winter). A very interesting and varied number. Mr. Mark Sullivan writes on "President Hoover in International Relations" and Mr. Garrard Winston on "The Present Phase of the War Debts." Prof. W. E. Hocking's "The Working of the Mandates" urges that there should be in each mandated territory a resident representative of the League of Nations. Mr. J. T. Adams discusses "Henry Adams and the New Physics." Mr. Gamaliel Bradford's "Athirst for God" is a study of Madame Guyon; Mr. A. H. Quinn's "The Merry Chase of Fact" deals with plays and the theatre; while Mr. Lucien Price's "Orpheus in Zion" tells of his experience in the Chautauqua movement, leading to the verdict, "When business and religion keep house together, business wears the breeches."

The Review and Expositor (Bapt., Louisville, Kentucky, January). Two articles deal with Palestine, and Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke examines a Russian Communist's book about the Baptists. Dr. C. N. Bartlett writes on "The Realization of the Trinity", and Dr. E. S. Reaves's address on "The Ministerial Office" is printed.

The Anglican Theological Review (January). Dr. E. J. Goodspeed argues that *Ephesians* is a Paulinist encyclical written as an introduction to a corpus of Paul's letters. Mr. Fleming James writes on *Hosea*, and Mr. C. R. Bowen on the Fourth Gospel.

DISCUSSIONS.

THE HUMAN NATURE OF JESUS:

A REPLY TO THE REV. A. D. MARTIN.

My first duty in replying to the Rev. A. D. Martin's article in the January number of *The Congregational Quarterly* is to acknowledge, and thank him for, the kindly and appreciative way in which he refers to my work. He fears, however, that much learning doth turn me to literal-mindedness, and that I "suffer from some severe disability through the very meticulousness of (my) intellectual labours". He wonders whether I "approximate to that perfect poise" needed for the interpretation of ancient literature, and at one point "is almost driven to regard (me) as a special pleader, bent upon denying" Jesus' infallibility, "rather than a serious investigator . . .". I am afraid I must deny the soft impeachment. If I lack that perfect poise which Matthew Arnold demanded, I suppose I share the defect with every imperfect human enquirer. I acknowledge a penchant for accuracy (and therefore hope I have never spelt Origen's name "Origines"). For the rest, I hope to be regarded as a normal human being, with a "poise" at any rate not worse than the average. My one desire is to get at the Truth; and I ask for the acceptance of no argument that does not carry conviction to other reasonable seekers.

An important question of principle emerges at the outset. After exclaiming "Let us face facts", Mr. Martin complains that some modern scholars are amazingly blind or indifferent to the consequences of their doctrines. This is a complaint that condemns itself. For how is Truth to be won unless those that seek it *are* indifferent to its consequences? He who investigates a historical problem with one eye all the time on the desirability or undesirability of a particular conclusion is disloyal to Truth. In other words, he is not "facing facts". The historian's business is to seek the Truth at all costs, and let the consequences take care of themselves. As a Christian investigator, I can do that with a light heart, because I know that, if the cause of Truth be served with a single eye, Faith cannot really suffer. Mr. Martin explains that what he has in mind is rather the devitalizing effect of views like my own on organized Christianity, as seen in the emptiness of our pews. But popularity is no test of Truth, as Jesus Himself experienced, nor do empty pews prove that the historical opinions of the preachers are unsound. Besides, it is a pure assumption that the modernist views of Jesus is responsible for emptying our pews. That emptiness may be due just as much to attempts on the part of the pulpit to maintain a historically untenable view of Him.

Mr. Martin seems to me not to allow sufficiently for the effect on our Lord's mind of His early education and training. Jesus was born and brought up in a pious Jewish home, and "increased in wisdom". He went through the normal process of human development, and was steeped in the religious traditions of His people. Not only did He speak in the linguistic idiom of Aramaic; He also thought in the intellectual idiom of Judaism. The uniqueness and holiness of His Person and character do not disprove or invalidate that fact, nor are they in any way inconsistent with it. If, as most admit, He shared to some extent the intellectual limitations of His time and nationality, these limitations must to some extent have affected His formulation of religious truths; for such formulation can never be wholly unaffected by the intellectual qualities of him who formulates. If therefore we find in the Gospels some statements reported on good

7 authority as having been uttered by Jesus, but (to all appearance) conflicting sharply with what on other grounds we firmly believe to be true, why should we not in deference to Truth draw the obvious conclusion?

Furthermore, is it not a curious inversion of things to go about to demonstrate Jesus' infallibility by strained interpretations of His difficult sayings, and by giving Him the benefit of the doubt every time His precise meaning is in the least degree uncertain, and then to acclaim that infallibility as an essential foundation for faith? Surely the sounder method of approach is to concentrate thankfully and reverently on His proved power as our Saviour to give us confidence in the voice of God's Spirit within us, and on the unspeakable enrichment of mind and heart whenever, prompted by God's voice within, we turn afresh to the study of that life of His which is God's Word without. This power, this enrichment, are unaffected by 1 the recognition of human limitations in His knowledge; and as long as that is so, New Testament faith in Him is not imperilled.

Now for the specific points which Mr. Martin raises. I will not linger on the authorship of the Pentateuch and Ps. 110, except to observe that the analogy with *Titus Andronicus* is imperfect, seeing that Jesus unquestionably accepted the traditional view as true, and apparently did not possess the means of correcting it. I also pass by the unpardonable sin, as Mr. Martin accepts my suggestion regarding it. Nor would I overpress language like that of *Luke* 19²⁷, though I confess I cannot feel as comfortable about it as he evidently does.

Mr. Martin declines to say that Jesus was in error regarding demon-possession. I agree that other beings than living men, such as angels and demons, may and probably do exist. But that is not quite the point. If 1 Mr. Martin is right, a legion of demons actually did possess the Gerasene maniac, and an unclean spirit the epileptic boy. Along with most Christians, I cannot believe that; yet clearly, Jesus either believed it or was pretending to believe it. I prefer the former alternative as being historically the more probable. It is also ethically the more honourable to Jesus.

Mr. Martin rejects, as special pleading and not serious investigation, my statement that there are traces of determinism in Jesus' teaching. Now the *O.T.* shows that religious Jews generally were inclined, like other Semites, to take a deterministic view of the Almighty and supreme causality of God. It was not consistently adhered to, as an adequate philosophical system; and it never deterred a prophet from appealing to his hearers' sense of moral responsibility. Yet it was there. It entered, as Josephus tells us, into the beliefs of the Pharisees, with whose theology the rank and file of the Jewish nation agreed. It makes its appearance in the primitive Church (*Acts* 2²³, 4²⁷); it plays a large part in the theology of Paul (*Rom.* 9); it pervades the Fourth Gospel; as a scriptural doctrine it dominated Augustine and Calvin. When therefore I find that Jesus, bred as He was in the atmosphere and traditions of Jewish piety, is reported to have used such language as this: "Lead us not into temptation", "Every plant that My Heavenly Father has not planted", "How then should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?", "not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, that the scripture might be fulfilled", I draw the natural conclusion that up to a point He adopted the often deterministic Jewish phraseology of His day. (I suggest for consideration the possibility that this may be in part the true explanation of the cry of dereliction from the cross). My "traces" therefore are not hypothetical and subjective special-pleading (as Mr. Martin supposes), but objective facts, which must be taken seriously and properly accounted for.

I have suggested that, had Jesus known what the woman who touched His garment was suffering from, He would not have pressed His question "Who touched me?". Mr. Martin mentions this as an example of my amazing literalism, and asks: "Is any comment needed . . . ?". Certainly comment is needed. Granting that modern Western etiquette differs from that of the ancient East, can Mr. Martin maintain that the woman did not shun publicity because of the nature of her complaint? Can it be proved that Jewish women of the first century had no objection to discussing their feminine ailments in the hearing of a street-crowd? However that may be, I make my appeal to the simple statement of *Mark* (5³³), who tells us that the woman was "frightened and trembling, knowing what had happened to her". It seems only reasonable to suppose that her feelings were due largely to the character of her illness. And whether that be so or not, it is at least arguable that Jesus, had He known that she was "frightened and trembling", would not have insisted on her making a public confession.

I cannot enlarge in detail on the eschatological sayings of Jesus, which Mr. Martin finds himself able to square with his own modern views by interpreting them as pure poetry and symbolism. I can only say that such an exegesis, carried to the lengths that he carries it, seems to me to be forced. He quotes a Jewish maxim: "Whoever translates a verse of scripture according to its outward form is a liar". He does not tell us the date and precise meaning of this word of wisdom; and I must decline to accept it either as a historically true description of ancient Rabbinic exegesis, or an ethically sound maxim for modern Christian exegesis. The belief in the resurrection of the flesh, for instance, is a well-attested item in Palestinian Jewish theology; and in view of the language Jesus used (*e.g.*, *Mt.* 5^{28f}, 10²⁸, 18^{8f}, *Lk.* 16^{23ff}, *etc.*), I see no ground for denying that He shared it. I do not doubt that both He and the Jewish apocalyptists sometimes spoke in a poetical and symbolic way: but the fact that teaching is given in rhythmical form by no means proves that it is meant figuratively (see, *e.g.*, the *Sibylline Oracles*). The language Jesus used, with its allusions to a personal Parousia to take place within that generation, is, in my judgment, much too concrete to be interpreted as pure symbolism. I have carefully re-read Mr. Martin's article on the subject in *The Congregational Quarterly* for April, 1927; and while I respect his view, I am still unable to share it. He adduces the phrases "from henceforth" (*Mt.* 26⁶⁴), "from now" (*Luke* 22⁶⁹), in Jesus' reply to Caiaphas, as necessitating a purely spiritual view of the Parousia. But these phrases are absent from *Mk.* (14⁶²); and—whatever their meaning—they leave other allusions to a cataclysmic Parousia untouched. The unanimous expectation of such a Parousia by the early Church tells strongly in favour of a concrete interpretation of Jesus' words. Mr. Martin's view that the early Christians failed to understand Him here, as they did on unclean foods, rests on a false analogy: for the cleanness of all foods was not a frequent topic of His speech, was not even one of His explicit assertions, but an *inference* that had to be drawn from a single general utterance (*Mk.* 7^{18f}). Nor does the failure of His early followers to understand His universalism prove that they misunderstood His eschatology: concentration on Israel as the strategic centre for the Kingdom had been a very prominent feature of His mission; only two of His sayings *explicitly* universalize the preaching of the Gospel (*Mk.* 13¹⁰, 14⁹), and even if they be genuine, they probably did not make a deep impression on their hearers. For the disciples, the universalism of the Gospel, like the cleanness of all food, had to be more a

matter of inference and of spiritual consistency than of obedience to clearly remembered instructions.¹

That Jesus spoke with emphasis about His Parousia (*Mk.* 13³¹) does not essentially alter the situation; for of course had He not believed His prophecies to be true, He would not have uttered them. And what we are compelled to believe mistaken is not the Parousia-teaching as a whole or in essence, but only the form in which it was conveyed. The essential fact that after His death He would return to His own in triumph, vindicated by God, remains unaffected by the elimination of the apocalyptic setting.

Mr. Martin wonders how I can tolerate the thought that Jesus *may possibly* have believed in eternal punishment, when I characterize the Romanist view of it as intellectually incredible and morally outrageous. But surely there would be a very big moral difference between (1) accepting a doctrine instilled into one by authority in early years, and reaching, before an early death, a thought-synthesis complete enough to reveal its inconsistency with the heart of one's Gospel, and so to ensure its rejection, and (2) maintaining a weak doctrine when its weakness has long been dragged out into the light of day, and ample time and thought have been given to the demonstration of its falsity.

In turning now to the more difficult question of Jesus' sinlessness, I urge that account must be taken of two important facts: (1) the baffling connexion (in human experience) between avoidable and blameworthy wrongdoing on the one hand and, on the other, the more or less venial yet often serious imperfection (in its myriad forms) which is incidental to all natural human growth; and (2) the customary Jewish use (based, of course, on sad experience) of the term "sin" not only for the former but for much of the latter, and the consequent unquestioned belief that sin was in some measure present, and necessarily present, in every human life. These two facts, the former in particular, are ignored in Mr. Martin's article, as in so much modern apologetic on the subject, wherein it is presupposed that we possess an adequate psychology of the human moral consciousness, such as in fact we do not possess. Now Jesus was subject throughout boyhood and youth to the constant influence of normal Jewish teaching; further, He went through the normal process of human development, increasing in wisdom and learning obedience. It is therefore unlikely *a priori*, notwithstanding His unique moral and spiritual nature, that He should have thought of Himself as marked off by absolute sinlessness from the rest of human-kind.

And with this conclusion such actual data as we possess agree. Mr. Martin does not refer to that remarkable fragment of the probably first-century *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which says: "Behold! the Lord's mother and his brothers said unto him, 'John the Baptist is baptizing unto the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him'. But He said unto them: 'What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him?—unless perchance this very thing that I have said is ignorance'". One cannot be sure that this is true history; but psychologically it fits exactly the conditions so far as we know them, and it is not the sort of thing a Christian writer would invent.

As for the other passages quoted in this connexion by Mr. Martin and myself, I do not deny that Paul and the authors of *Hebrews*, *I Peter*, and *I John* thought of Jesus as sinless; but that does not necessarily settle the question of His own thoughts on the matter. I cannot accept, in regard

¹ See further *Expository Times*, Nov., 1926, 60, and Dec., 1926, 138.

to Jesus' refusal of the address "Good Master" or of His submission to baptism, those explanations which Mr. Martin regards as obviously accurate and adequate. I see no justification for them in the Gospel-narratives. There is no evidence whatever that the Rich Young Ruler's address was "perhaps glib" or insincere; and in order to maintain his point, Mr. Martin has to accuse the final editor (why not the author?) of our first gospel of being unintelligent. Personally I prefer to trust "Matthew's" idea of what Jesus' words as given in *Mk.* 10¹⁸ meant, rather than Mr. Martin's; though, of course, I do not approve of the evangelist's handling of his source at this point. Nor do the Gospels give us to understand that Jesus accepted John's baptism only in order to express His sympathy with sinners.¹ Mr. Martin's explanations on both these points seem to me unmistakable (if unconscious) special pleading. They are exactly the kind of theories that no one would have thought of advancing, had he not got an *a priori* theory to defend.

Let it be clearly understood that to challenge the dogmatic assertion of Jesus' sinlessness as a supposedly obvious historical datum on which a theory of His Person can at once be built is not to call in question for a moment the moral purity, nobility, and serenity of His character, the creative power and unique holiness of His Person, and the saving efficacy of His Work. To maintain the contrary is to assume knowledge where we do not possess it. The logic of the argument: "If not sinless, then tainted and of questionable character", looks impregnable on paper: in reality, it lacks cogency because the terms are ambiguous and obscure. Doubtless the Gospels truly represent Jesus to us as one who ever desired to carry out His Father's will. But must you and I, whenever we have to repent of, to blame ourselves and apologize for, and to try to eradicate imperfections in our characters, admit that such imperfections represent wilful revolt against God? May we not plead that they are present in spite of our own serious disapproval of them? The impossibility of being precise on the matter was brought home to me by an orthodox friend with whom I was once discussing the subject: though passionately insisting on Jesus' sinlessness, he conceded that He must sometimes have lost His temper as a boy, and that He did not attain "perfection" before the end of His earthly ministry! When terms are so fluid in meaning, it is better not to select them as pivots of doctrine. Any doctrine therefore of our Lord's sinlessness must ultimately be an inference from, or implicate of, our faith in His Person, not one of the historical data on which that faith (in the doctrinal sense) is built.²

In regard to the religious values at stake, I would say that, while I revere profoundly the religious passion behind the last page of Mr. Martin's article, I cannot regard even that as entitled to decide questions of history. Experiences, intuitions, and inferences in the realm of man's deepest spiritual life are much too imperfectly analysable and comprehensible to prove or disprove statements about past events. I feel it in my very bones that, so long as we are studying history, we must allow the records to speak for themselves, instead of pressing them to yield only such conclusions as our religious experience and our theology persuade us are necessary for our faith. That historical truth, simply and directly sought by those modern methods that are unquestioningly trusted in other fields, must prove helpful to and not destructive of the real values of religion, is,

¹ Not even does *Mt.* 314^f do so: but the passage is in all probability simply another attempt on the part of this evangelist to evade the awkward implications of traditionally guaranteed facts.

² Cf. H. R. Mackintosh, *Person of Jesus Christ*, 403, n.

I contend, an axiom fundamental to Christian theism. And experience teaches me that this axiom is exemplified in the question before us. Such conclusions about Jesus as historical study has led me to accept have enriched and not impoverished my religious life, strengthened and not weakened my faith in God, enhanced and not diminished my loyalty to His Son. There is enough in the Gospels, when allowed to speak for themselves under scientific scrutiny, to portray for us a Divine Life which in a unique way brings God home to us and us home to God. Why should we ask for a better Gospel than that?

C. J. CADOUX.

MR. MARTIN'S REJOINDER.

By the courtesy of the Editor I am permitted to make a brief rejoinder to Dr. Cadoux. Both time and space preclude any fullness therein and I have no desire to make small debating points.

Dr. Cadoux misunderstands me. When I complain that he and those who think with him are blind to the consequences of their *doctrines*, I am not asking them to be anxious as to the consequences of *facts*. Every historical investigation should be judicial in the assembling of the relevant facts. But it is in the interpretation of facts that one should have an eye to consequences. This holds good very specially in the realm of religion, where if our interpretations are true they must react favourably upon life. Conversely, if with the propagation of certain interpretations a blight falls upon life, is it not wise for us to reconsider our position? Possibly I am wrong in my diagnosis of the present position in our churches, but as I look at Church History I am convinced that the views I have combated have a close resemblance to those that are associated with the ebb-tides and backwaters of Christianity, like the Deism of England, for example, before the Methodist revival.

Dr. Cadoux's new comment upon the teaching of Jesus respecting eternal punishment illustrates the profound unsatisfactoriness of his valuation of our Lord. The inevitable implication of this comment is that, in this matter at any rate, Jesus is obsolescent. We have outgrown Him. But to outgrow Him here is to have a closer access to God than He had, not only in intellectual matters but in regions where such phrases as "morally outrageous" have currency. That raises the question, Why should we call ourselves Christians?

I think there is some failure on Dr. Cadoux's part to credit the independence of thought in those outside his own school. Thus in regard to some of my exegetical attempts he observes, "They are exactly the kind of theories that no one would have thought of advancing, had he not got an *a priori* theory to defend". Now my critic may be able to anticipate the developments of his own mind—and on various grounds I sincerely hope he can—but he is really not in the position to say what are the processes likely to operate in my mind. I must frankly tell him he is quite wrong if he imagines my exegesis in these high themes has been governed by my theology. Of course it does not much matter that he should seek to reconstruct my mental habits for me, but the trouble is that he takes up the same kind of enterprise in relation to Jesus. He finds "traces of determinism" in the teaching of our Lord—and concerning such as he has named much might be said on quite other lines than his—but he appears to place Jesus' entire personality in a determinist category. He is one whose mind and spirit are in a rigidly interlocked Semitic series. What was held by Jews generally governs His thinking. It is this I deny. That

He was nourished in Jewish piety I know, but I am equally certain there was no current religious idiom, apocalyptic or other, which on His lip was not changed in value and significance. To apply to Him the words of Ignatius to the Roman Church, He was "filled with the grace of God without wavering, and filtered clear from every foreign stain". Filtered and filled, the mind of Hebraism in Him rose immeasurably above the mind of His time. If I may be pardoned a repetition, One who could speak of the coming of John the Baptist as the return of Elijah, certainly revealed great independence of thought, and, in particular, must have used the imagery of return in a symbolic way. The bearing of this upon the references to His own return is obvious but is generally overlooked.

Again: what for want of a better word I must call the mystic quality of our Lord's mind is apt to escape us. Take, e.g., the saying which constitutes the *Magna Carta* of Congregationalism, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*. The verbs are in the present tense. The saying, therefore, had its application in the days of His flesh—was, indeed, primarily intended in relation, not to any future organization of Christian groups, but to those occasional meetings of disciples who, even at the time when Jesus spoke, were scattered up and down the Holy Land. For so quickening and beneficent a ministry as was His must surely have produced such gatherings. Many who, tied by their circumstances, could not share His wanderings, yet revered His person and loved fellowship. That Jesus should have affirmed His presence with these scattered followers whilst He was still a mortal man opens to us the eternal quality of His communion with the Father—a communion which carried with it all the implicates of a Divine self-diffusion, intimate knowledge, sympathy and guidance. But, if this is what presence, or parousia, meant to Him then, must we not think of any later parousia after the resurrection in a manner at least as spiritual? Is it quite reasonable to think He expected to come again seated literally on the edge of a cumulus cloud?

I have almost had the feeling of a conscious desecrator in even discussing the sinlessness of Jesus, but all the goodly fellowship of Christian men is impaired where that is denied. It is the frontier-mark between the territories of God and man, the place where the one passes into the other. Dr. Cadoux's psychological difficulties are, I think, of his own creation. Does not theology generally keep the use of the term "sin" to those acts and states out of harmony with the will of God which involve an element of volition? Even an explosion of bad temper must always carry with it some swift assent of our self to the overthrowing of restraint. To extend the use of the term to cover moral immaturity is like putting a rosebud into the category of diseased roses only because its petals are still small and infolded. So far as evidence for sin in Jesus is concerned, I see none in the canonical Gospels. Dr. Cadoux quotes a confession of Jesus in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, a scripture which he thinks is of the first century, though our oldest authority for it is Jerome. If the saying is genuine it expresses a moment of moral indecision, not a characteristic mood of Jesus. It sounds like the "pious" invention of one who felt, as Dr. Cadoux feels, bound by the character of John's baptism to ascribe to Jesus some consciousness of sin, but yet desired to let Him off lightly.

I agree that the doctrine of our Lord's sinlessness must be an inference of faith. So I have long held it. It is faith interpreting all the historic data about Him. Without such faith we may have a gospel of the Selected Ideas of Jesus but no message which can redeem mankind.

A. D. MARTIN.

205/CON



2757

